

























THE  
HOME AND FOREIGN  
REVIEW.

SEU VETUS EST VERUM DILIGO SIVE NOVUM.

VOLUME I.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,  
14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON,  
AND 20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.  
1862.

THE

HOME AND FOREIGN

REVIEW

LONDON:

PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVEY, AND FRANKLYN  
Great New Street and Fetter Lane.

VOLUME I.

WILLIAM AND WOODHEAD

PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVEY, AND FRANKLYN

Great New Street and Fetter Lane.

1851



THE  
HOME AND FOREIGN REVIEW.

---

JULY 1862.

---

NATIONALITY.

WHENEVER great intellectual cultivation has been combined with that suffering which is inseparable from extensive changes in the condition of the people, men of speculative or imaginative genius have sought in the contemplation of an ideal society a remedy, or at least a consolation, for evils which they were practically unable to remove. Poetry has always preserved the idea, that at some distant time or place, in the Western islands or the Arcadian region, an innocent and contented people, free from the corruption and restraint of civilised life, have realised the legends of the golden age. The office of the poets is always nearly the same, and there is little variation in the features of their ideal world; but when philosophers attempt to admonish or reform mankind by devising an imaginary state, their motive is more definite and immediate, and their commonwealth is a satire as well as a model. Plato and Plotinus, More and Campanella, constructed their fanciful societies with those materials which were omitted from the fabric of the actual communities, by the defects of which they were inspired. The Republic, the Utopia, and the City of the Sun, were protests against a state of things which the experience of their authors taught them to condemn, and from the faults of which they took refuge in the opposite extremes. They remained without influence, and have never passed from literary into political history, because something more than discontent and speculative ingenuity is needed, in order to invest a political idea with power over the masses of mankind.

The scheme of a philosopher can command the practical allegiance of fanatics only, not of nations; and though oppression may give rise to violent and repeated outbreaks, like the convulsions of a man in pain, it cannot mature a settled purpose and plan of regeneration, unless a new notion of happiness is joined to the sense of present evil.

The history of religion furnishes a complete illustration. Between the later medieval sects and Protestantism there is an essential difference, that outweighs the points of analogy found in those systems which are regarded as heralds of the Reformation, and is enough to explain the vitality of the last in comparison with the others. Whilst Wycliffe and Hus contradicted certain particulars of the Catholic teaching, Luther rejected the authority of the Church, and gave to the individual conscience an independence which was sure to lead to an incessant resistance. There is a similar difference between the Revolt of the Netherlands, the Great Rebellion, the War of Independence, or the rising of Brabant, on the one hand, and the French Revolution on the other. Before 1789, insurrections were provoked by particular wrongs, and were justified by definite complaints and by an appeal to principles which all men acknowledged. New theories were sometimes advanced in the cause of controversy, but they were accidental, and the great argument against tyranny was fidelity to the ancient laws. Since the change produced by the French Revolution, those aspirations which are awakened by the evils and defects of the social state have come to act as permanent and energetic forces throughout the civilised world. They are spontaneous and aggressive, needing no prophet to proclaim, no champion to defend them, but popular, unreasoning, and almost irresistible. The Revolution effected this change, partly by its doctrines, partly by the indirect influence of events. It taught the people to regard their wishes and wants as the supreme criterion of right. The rapid vicissitudes of power, in which each party successively appealed to the favour of the masses as the arbiter of success, accustomed the masses to be arbitrary as well as insubordinate. The fall of many governments, and the frequent redistribution of territory, deprived all settlements of the dignity of permanence. Tradition and prescription ceased to be guardians of authority; and the arrangements which proceeded from revolutions, from the triumphs of war, and from treaties of peace, were equally regardless of established rights. Duty cannot be dissociated from right, and nations refuse to be controlled by laws which are no protection.

In this condition of the world, theory and action follow



close upon each other, and practical evils easily give birth to opposite systems. In the realms of free-will, the regularity of natural progress is preserved by the conflict of extremes. The impulse of the reaction carries men from one extremity towards another. The pursuit of a remote and ideal object, which captivates the imagination by its splendour and the reason by its simplicity, evokes an energy which would not be inspired by a rational, possible end, limited by many antagonistic claims, and confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just. One excess, or exaggeration, is the corrective of the other, and error promotes truth, where the masses are concerned, by counterbalancing a contrary error. The few have not strength to achieve great changes unaided; the many have not wisdom to be moved by truth unmixed. Where the disease is various, no particular definite remedy can meet the wants of all. Only the attraction of an abstract idea, or of an ideal state, can unite in a common action multitudes who seek a universal cure for many special evils, and a common restorative applicable to many different conditions. And hence false principles, which correspond with the bad as well as with the just aspirations of mankind, are a normal and necessary element in the social life of nations.

Theories of this kind are just, inasmuch as they are provoked by definite ascertained evils, and undertake their removal. They are useful in opposition, as a warning or a threat, to modify existing things, and keep awake the consciousness of wrong. They cannot serve as a basis for the reconstruction of civil society, as medicine cannot serve for food; but they may influence it with advantage, because they point out the direction, though not the measure, in which reform is needed. They oppose an order of things which is the result of a selfish and violent abuse of power by the ruling classes, and of artificial restriction on the natural progress of the world, destitute of an ideal element or a moral purpose. Practical extremes differ from the theoretical extremes they provoke, because the first are both arbitrary and violent, whilst the last, though also revolutionary, are at the same time remedial. In one case the wrong is voluntary, in the other it is inevitable. This is the general character of the contest between the existing order and the subversive theories that deny its legitimacy. There are three principal theories of this kind, impugning the present distribution of power, of property, and of territory, and attacking respectively the aristocracy, the middle class, and the sovereignty. They are the theories of equality, communism, and national-

ity. Though sprung from a common origin, opposing cognate evils, and connected by many links, they did not appear simultaneously. Rousseau proclaimed the first, Babœuf the second, Mazzini the third; and the third is the most recent in its appearance, the most attractive at the present time, and the richest in promise of future power.

In the old European system, the rights of nationalities were neither recognised by governments nor asserted by the people. The interests of the reigning families, not those of the nations, regulated the frontiers; and the administration was conducted generally without any reference to popular desires. Where all liberties were suppressed, the claims of national independence were necessarily ignored, and a princess, in the words of Fénelon, carried a monarchy in her wedding portion. The eighteenth century acquiesced in this oblivion of corporate rights on the Continent; for the absolutists cared only for the state, and the liberals only for the individual. The Church, the nobles, and the nation, had no place in the popular theories of the age; and they devised none in their own defence, for they were not openly attacked. The aristocracy retained its privileges, and the Church her property; and the dynastic interest, which overruled the natural inclination of the nations and destroyed their independence, nevertheless maintained their integrity. The national sentiment was not wounded in its most sensitive part. To dispossess a sovereign of his hereditary crown, and to annex his dominions, would have been held to inflict an injury upon all monarchies, and to furnish their subjects with a dangerous example, by depriving royalty of its inviolable character. In time of war, as there was no national cause at stake, there was no attempt to rouse national feeling. The courtesy of the rulers towards each other was proportionate to the contempt for the lower orders. Compliments passed between the commanders of hostile armies; there was no bitterness, and no excitement; battles were fought with the pomp and pride of a parade. The art of war became a slow and learned game. The monarchies were united not only by a natural community of interests, but by family alliances. A marriage contract sometimes became the signal for an interminable war, whilst family connections often set a barrier to ambition. After the wars of religion came to an end in 1648, the only wars were those which were waged for an inheritance or a dependency, or against countries whose system of government exempted them from the common law of dynastic states, and made them not only unprotected but obnoxious. These countries were England and Holland, until



Holland ceased to be a republic, and until, in England, the defeat of the Jacobites in the Forty-five terminated the struggle for the crown. There was one country, however, which still continued to be an exception; one monarch whose place was not admitted in the comity of kings.

Poland did not possess those securities for stability which were supplied by dynastic connections, and the theory of legitimacy, wherever a crown could be obtained by marriage or inheritance. A monarch without royal blood, a crown bestowed by the nation, were an anomaly and an outrage in that age of dynastic absolutism. The country was excluded from the European system by the nature of its institutions. It excited a cupidity which could not be satisfied. It gave the reigning families of Europe no hope of permanently strengthening themselves by intermarriage with its rulers, or of obtaining it by bequest or by inheritance. The Habsburgs had contested the possession of Spain and the Indies with the French Bourbons, of Italy with the Spanish Bourbons, of the empire with the house of Wittelsbach, of Silesia with the house of Hohenzollern. There had been wars between rival houses for half the territories of Italy and Germany. But none could hope to redeem their losses, or increase their power, in a country to which marriage and descent gave no claim. Where they could not permanently inherit, they endeavoured, by intrigues, to prevail at each election, and after contending in support of candidates who were their partisans, the neighbours at last appointed an instrument for the final demolition of the Polish state. Till then no nation had been deprived of its political existence by the Christian powers, and whatever disregard had been shown for national interests and sympathies, some care had been taken to conceal the wrong by a hypocritical perversion of law. But the partition of Poland was an act of wanton violence committed in open defiance not only of popular feeling, but of public law. For the first time in modern history, a great state was suppressed, and a whole nation divided among its enemies.

This famous measure, the most revolutionary act of the old absolutism, awakened the theory of nationality in Europe, converting a dormant right into an aspiration, and a sentiment into a political claim. "No wise or honest man," wrote Edmund Burke, "can approve of that partition, or can contemplate it without prognosticating great mischief from it to all countries at some future time."<sup>1</sup> Thenceforward there

<sup>1</sup> Observations on the Conduct of the Minority,—Works, v. 112.

was a nation demanding to be united in a state,—a soul, as it were, wandering in search of a body in which to begin life over again; and, for the first time, a cry was heard that the arrangement of states was unjust—that their limits were unnatural, and that a whole people was deprived of its right to constitute an independent community. Before that claim could be efficiently asserted against the overwhelming power of its opponents,—before it gained energy, after the last partition, to overcome the influence of long habits of submission, and of the contempt which previous disorders had brought upon Poland,—the ancient European system was in ruins, and a new world was rising in its place. The old despotic policy which made the Poles its prey had two adversaries,—the spirit of English liberty, and the doctrines of that revolution which destroyed the French monarchy with its own weapons; and these two contradicted in contrary ways the theory that nations have no collective rights.

At the present day, the theory of nationality is not only the most powerful auxiliary of revolution, but its actual substance in the movements of the last three years. This, however, is a recent alliance, unknown to the first French Revolution. The modern theory of nationality arose partly as a legitimate consequence, partly as a reaction against it. As the system which overlooked national divisions was opposed by liberalism in two forms, the French and the English, so the system which insists upon them proceeds from two distinct sources, and exhibits the character either of 1688 or of 1789. When the French people abolished the authorities under which it lived, and became its own master, France was in danger of dissolution: for the common will is difficult to ascertain, and does not readily agree. “The laws,” said Vergniaud, in the debate on the sentence of the king, “are obligatory only as the presumptive will of the people, which retains the right of approving or condemning them. The instant it manifests its wish, the work of the national representation, the law, must disappear.” This doctrine resolved society into its natural elements, and threatened to break up the country into as many republics as there were *communes*. For true republicanism is the principle of self-government in the whole and in all the parts. In an extensive country, it can prevail only by the union of several independent communities in a single confederacy, as in Greece, in Switzerland, in the Netherlands, and in America; so that a large republic not founded on the federal principle must result in the government of a single city, like Rome and Paris, and, in a less degree, Athens, Berne, and Amsterdam; or, in other



words, a great democracy must either sacrifice self-government to unity, or preserve it by federalism.

The France of history fell together with the French state, which was the growth of centuries. The old sovereignty was destroyed. The local authorities were looked upon with aversion and alarm. The new central authority needed to be established on a new principle of unity. The state of nature, which was the ideal of society, was made the basis of the nation; descent was put in the place of tradition; and the French people was regarded as a physical product,—an ethnological, not historic, unit. It was assumed that a unity existed separate from the representation and the government, wholly independent of the past, and capable at any moment of expressing or of changing its mind. In the words of Sieyès, it was no longer France, but some unknown country to which the nation was transported. The central power possessed authority, inasmuch as it obeyed the whole, and no divergence was permitted from the universal sentiment. This power, endowed with volition, was personified in the Republic One and Indivisible. The title signified that a part could not speak or act for the whole,—that there was a power supreme over the state, distinct from, and independent of, its members; and it expressed, for the first time in history, the notion of an abstract nationality.

In this manner, the idea of the sovereignty of the people uncontrolled by the past gave birth to the idea of nationality independent of the political influence of history. It sprang from the rejection of the two authorities,—of the state and of the past. The kingdom of France was, geographically as well as politically, the product of a long series of events, and the same influences which built up the state formed the territory. The Revolution repudiated alike the agencies to which France owed her boundaries, and those to which she owed her government. Every effaceable trace and relic of national history was carefully wiped away,—the system of administration, the physical divisions of the country, the classes of society, the corporations, the weights and measures, the calendar. France was no longer bounded by the limits she had received from the condemned influence of her history; she could recognise only those which were set by nature. The definition of the nation was borrowed from the material world, and, in order to avoid a loss of territory, it became not only an abstraction, but a fiction.

There was a principle of nationality in the ethnological character of the movement, which is the source of the common observation that revolution is more frequent in Catholic than

in Protestant countries. It is in fact more frequent in the Latin than in the Teutonic world, because it depends partly on a national impulse which is only awakened where there is an alien element, the vestige of a foreign domination, to expel. Western Europe has undergone two conquests,—one by the Romans, and one by the Germans,—and twice received laws from the invaders. Each time it rose again against the victorious race; and the two great reactions, while they differ according to the different characters of the two conquests, have the phenomenon of imperialism in common. The Roman republic laboured to crush the subjugated nations into a homogeneous and obedient mass; but the increase which the proconsular authority obtained in the process subverted the republican government, and the reaction of the provinces against Rome assisted in establishing the empire. The Cæsarean system gave an unprecedented freedom to the dependencies, and raised them to a civil equality which put an end to the dominion of race over race and of class over class. The monarchy was hailed as a refuge from the pride and cupidity of the Roman people; and the love of equality, the hatred of nobility, and the tolerance of despotism, implanted by Rome, became, at least in Gaul, the chief feature of the national character. But among the nations whose vitality had been broken down by the stern republic, not one retained the materials necessary to enjoy independence, or to develop a new history. The political faculty which organises states and binds society in a moral order was exhausted, and the Christian doctors looked in vain over the waste of ruins for a people by whose aid the Church might survive the decay of Rome. A new element of national life was brought to that declining world by the enemies who destroyed it. The flood of barbarians settled over it for a season, and then subsided; and when the landmarks of civilisation appeared once more, it was found that the soil had been impregnated with a fertilising and regenerating influence, and that the inundation had laid the germs of future states and of a new society. The political sense and energy came with the new blood, and was exhibited in the power exercised by the younger race upon the old, and in the establishment of a graduated freedom. Instead of universal equal rights, the actual enjoyment of which is necessarily contingent on, and commensurate with, power, the rights of the people were made dependent on a variety of conditions, the first of which was the distribution of property. Civil society became a classified organism instead of a formless combination of atoms, and the feudal system gradually arose.



Roman Gaul had so thoroughly adopted the ideas of absolute authority and undistinguished equality during the five centuries between Cæsar and Clovis, that the people could never be reconciled to the new system. Feudalism remained a foreign importation, and the feudal aristocracy an alien race, and the common people of France sought protection against both in the Roman jurisprudence and the power of the crown. The development of absolute monarchy by the help of democracy is the one constant character of French history. The royal power, feudal at first, and limited by the immunities and the great vassals, became more popular as it grew more absolute; while the suppression of aristocracy, the removal of the intermediate authorities, was so particularly the object of the nation, that it was more energetically accomplished after the fall of the throne. The monarchy, which had been engaged from the thirteenth century in curbing the nobles, was at last thrust aside by the democracy, because it was too dilatory in the work, and was unable to deny its own origin and effectually ruin the class from which it sprung. All those things which constitute the peculiar character of the French Revolution, — the demand for equality, the hatred of nobility and feudalism, and of the Church which was connected with them, the constant reference to pagan examples, the suppression of monarchy, the new code of law, the breach with tradition, and the substitution of an ideal system for every thing that had proceeded from the mixture and mutual action of the races,—all these exhibit the common type of a reaction against the effects of the Frankish invasion. The hatred of royalty was less than the hatred of aristocracy; privileges were more detested than tyranny; and the king perished because of the origin of his authority, rather than because of its abuse. Monarchy unconnected with aristocracy became popular in France, even when most uncontrolled; whilst the attempt to reconstitute the throne, and to limit and fence it with its peers, broke down, because the old Teutonic elements on which it relied—hereditary nobility, primogeniture, and privilege—were no longer tolerated. The substance of the ideas of 1789 is not the limitation of the sovereign power, but the abrogation of intermediate powers. These powers, and the classes which enjoyed them, come in Latin Europe from a barbarian origin; and the movement which calls itself liberal is essentially national. If liberty were its object, its means would be the establishment of great independent authorities not derived from the state, and its model would be England. But its object is equality; and it seeks, like France in 1789, to cast out the elements of

inequality which were introduced by the Teutonic race. This is the object which Italy and Spain have had in common with France, and herein consists the natural league of the Latin nations.

This national element in the movement was not understood by the revolutionary leaders. At first, their doctrine appeared entirely contrary to the idea of nationality. They taught that certain general principles of government were absolutely right in all states; and they asserted in theory the unrestricted freedom of the individual, and the supremacy of the will over every external necessity or obligation. This is in apparent contradiction to the national theory, that certain natural forces ought to determine the character, the form, and the policy of the state, by which a kind of fate is put in the place of freedom. Accordingly the national sentiment was not developed directly out of the revolution in which it was involved, but was exhibited first in resistance to it, when the attempt to emancipate had been absorbed in the desire to subjugate, and the republic had been succeeded by the empire. Napoleon called a new power into existence by attacking nationality in Russia, by delivering it in Italy, by governing in defiance of it in Germany and Spain. The sovereigns of these countries were deposed or degraded; and a system of administration was introduced, which was French in its origin, its spirit, and its instruments. The people resisted the change. The movement against it was popular and spontaneous, because the rulers were absent or helpless; and it was national, because it was directed against foreign institutions. In Tyrol, in Spain, and afterwards in Prussia, the people did not receive the impulse from the government, but undertook of their own accord to cast out the armies and the ideas of revolutionised France. Men were made conscious of the national element of the revolution by its conquests, not in its rise. The three things which the empire most openly oppressed—religion, national independence, and political liberty—united in a shortlived league to animate the great uprising by which Napoleon fell. Under the influence of that memorable alliance a political spirit was called forth on the Continent, which clung to freedom and abhorred revolution, and sought to restore, to develope, and to reform the decayed national institutions. The men who proclaimed these ideas, Stein and Görres, Humboldt, Müller, and De Maistre,<sup>2</sup> were as hostile to Bonapartism as to the absolutism

<sup>2</sup> There are some remarkable thoughts on nationality in the state-papers of the Count de Maistre. "En premier lieu les nations sont quelque chose dans le monde, il n'est pas permis de les compter pour rien, de les affliger dans leurs



of the old governments, and insisted on the national rights, which had been invaded equally by both, and which they hoped to restore by the destruction of the French supremacy.

With the cause that triumphed at Waterloo the friends of the revolution had no sympathy, for they had learned to identify their doctrine with the cause of France. The Holland-House Whigs in England, the Afrancesados in Spain, the Muratists in Italy, and the partisans of the Confederation of the Rhine, merging patriotism in their revolutionary affections, regretted the fall of the French power, and looked with alarm at those new and unknown forces which the War of Deliverance had evoked, and which were as menacing to French liberalism as to French supremacy. But the new aspirations for national and popular rights were crushed at the restoration. The liberals of those days cared for freedom, not in the shape of national independence, but of French institutions; and they combined against the nations with the ambition of the governments. They were as ready to sacrifice nationality to their ideal, as the Holy Alliance was to the interests of absolutism. Talleyrand indeed declared at Vienna that the Polish question ought to have precedence over all other questions, because the partition of Poland had been one of the first and greatest causes of the evils which Europe had suffered; but dynastic interests prevailed. All the sovereigns represented at Vienna recovered their dominions, except the King of Saxony, who was punished for his fidelity to Napoleon; but the states that were unrepresented in the reigning families—Poland, Venice, and Genoa—were not revived, and even the Pope had great difficulty in recovering the Legations from the grasp of Austria. Nationality, which the old *régime* had ignored, which had been outraged by the revolution

convenances, dans leurs affections, dans leurs intérêts les plus chers . . . On le traité du 30 mai anéantit complètement la Savoie; il divise l'indivisible; il partage en trois portions une malheureuse nation de 400,000 hommes, une par la langue, une par la religion, une par le caractère, une par l'habitude invétérée, une enfin par les limites naturelles . . . L'union des nations ne souffre pas de difficultés sur la carte géographique; mais dans la réalité, c'est autre chose; il y a des nations *immiscibles*. . . Je lui parlai par occasion de l'esprit italien qui s'agit dans ce moment; il (Count Nesselrode) me répondit: 'Oui, monsieur; mais cet esprit est un grand mal, car il peut gêner les arrangements de l'Italie' " (*Correspondance Diplomatique de J. de Maistre*, ii. 7, 8, 21, 25). In the same year, 1815, Görres wrote: "In Italien wie allerwärts ist das Volk geweckt; es will etwas grossartiges, es will Ideen haben, die, wenn es sie auch nicht ganz begreift, doch einen freien unendlichen Gesichtskreis seiner Einbildung eröffnen . . . Es ist reiner Naturtrieb dass ein Volk, also scharf und deutlich in seine natürlichen Gränzen eingeschlossen, aus der Zerstreuung in die Einheit sich zu sammeln sucht" (*Werke*, ii. 20).

and the empire, received, after its first open demonstration, the hardest blow at the Congress of Vienna. The principle which the first partition had generated, to which the revolution had given a basis of theory, which had been lashed by the empire into a momentary convulsive effort, was matured by the long error of the restoration into a consistent doctrine, nourished and justified by the situation of Europe.

The governments of the Holy Alliance devoted themselves to suppress with equal care the revolutionary spirit by which they had been threatened, and the national spirit by which they had been restored. Austria, which owed nothing to the national movement, and had prevented its revival after 1809, naturally took the lead in repressing it. Every disturbance of the final settlements of 1815, every aspiration for changes or reforms, was condemned as sedition. This system repressed the good with the evil tendencies of the age; and the resistance which it provoked during the generation that passed away from the restoration to the fall of Metternich, and again under the reaction which commenced with Schwarzenberg and ended with the administrations of Bach and Manteuffel, proceeded from various combinations of the opposite forms of liberalism. In the successive phases of that struggle, the idea that national claims are above all other rights gradually rose to the supremacy which it now possesses among the revolutionary agencies.

The first liberal movement, that of the Carbonari in the South of Europe, had no specific national character, but was supported by the Bonapartists both in Spain and Italy. In the following years, the opposite ideas of 1813 came to the front, and a revolutionary movement, in many respects hostile to the principles of revolution, began in defence of liberty, religion, and nationality. All these causes were united in the Irish agitation, and in the Greek, Belgian, and Polish revolutions. Those sentiments which had been insulted by Napoleon, and had risen against him, rose against the governments of the restoration. They had been oppressed by the sword, and then by the treaties. The national principle added force, but not justice, to this movement, which, in every case but Poland, was successful. A period followed in which it degenerated into a purely national idea, as the agitation for repeal succeeded emancipation, and Pan-slavism and Panhellenism arose under the auspices of the Eastern Church. This was the third phase of the resistance to the settlement of Vienna, which was weak, because it failed to satisfy national or constitutional aspirations, either



of which would have been a safeguard against the other, by a moral if not by a popular justification. At first, in 1813, the people rose against their conquerors, in defence of their legitimate rulers. They refused to be governed by usurpers. In the period between 1825 and 1831, they resolved that they would not be misgoverned by strangers. The French administration was often better than that which it displaced; but there were prior claimants for the authority exercised by the French, and at first the national contest was a contest for legitimacy. In the second period this element was wanting. No dispossessed princes led the Greeks, the Belgians, or the Poles. The Turks, the Dutch, and the Russians were attacked, not as usurpers, but as oppressors,—because they misgoverned, not because they were of a different race. Then began a time when the text simply was, that nations would not be governed by foreigners. Power legitimately obtained, and exercised with moderation, was declared invalid. National rights, like religion, had borne part in the previous combinations, and had been auxiliaries in the struggles for freedom, but now nationality became a paramount claim, which was to assert itself alone, which might put forward as pretexts the rights of rulers, the liberties of the people, the safety of religion, but which, if no such union could be formed, was to prevail at the expense of every other cause for which nations make sacrifices.

Metternich is, next to Napoleon, the chief promoter of this theory; for the anti-national character of the restoration was most distinct in Austria, and it is in opposition to the Austrian government that nationality grew into a system. Napoleon, who, trusting to his armies, despised moral forces in politics, was overthrown by their rising. Austria committed the same fault in the government of her Italian provinces. The kingdom of Italy had united all the northern part of the Peninsula in a single state; and the national feelings, which the French repressed elsewhere, were encouraged as a safeguard of their power in Italy and in Poland. When the tide of victory turned, Austria invoked against the French the aid of the new sentiment they had fostered. Nugent announced, in his proclamation to the Italians, that they should become an independent nation. The same spirit served different masters, and contributed first to the destruction of the old states, then to the expulsion of the French, and again, under Charles Albert, to a new revolution. It was appealed to in the name of the most contradictory principles of government, and served all parties in succession, because it was one in which all could unite. Beginning by

a protest against the dominion of race over race, its mildest and least-developed form, it grew into a condemnation of every state that included different races, and finally became the complete and consistent theory, that the state and the nation must be coextensive. "It is," says Mr. Mill, "in general a necessary condition of free institutions, that the boundaries of governments should coincide in the main with those of nationalities."<sup>3</sup>

The outward historical progress of this idea from an indefinite aspiration to be the keystone of a political system, may be traced in the life of the man who gave to it the element in which its strength resides,—Giuseppe Mazzini. He found Carbonarism impotent against the measures of the governments, and resolved to give new life to the liberal movement by transferring it to the ground of nationality. Exile is the nursery of nationality, as oppression is the school of liberalism; and Mazzini conceived the idea of Young Italy when he was a refugee at Marseilles. In the same way, the Polish exiles are the champions of every national movement; for to them all political rights are absorbed in the idea of independence, which, however, they may differ with each other, is the one aspiration common to them all. Towards the year 1830, literature also contributed to the national idea. "It was the time," says Mazzini, "of the great conflict between the romantic and the classical school, which might with equal truth be called a conflict between the partisans of freedom and of authority." The romantic school was infidel in Italy, and Catholic in Germany; but in both it had the common effect of encouraging national history and literature, and Dante was as great an authority with the Italian democrats as with the leaders of the medieval revival at Vienna, Munich, and Berlin. But neither the influence of the exiles, nor that of the poets and critics of the new party, extended over the masses. It was a sect without popular sympathy or encouragement, a conspiracy founded not on a grievance, but on a doctrine; and when the attempt to rise was made in Savoy, in 1834, under a banner with the motto "Unity, Independence, God and Humanity," the people were puzzled at its object, and indifferent to its failure. But Mazzini continued his propaganda, developed his *Giovine Italia* into a *Giovine Europa*, and established in 1847 the international league of nations. "The people," he said, in his opening address, "is penetrated with only one idea, that of unity and nationality. . . . There is no international question as to forms of government, but only a national question."

<sup>3</sup> *Considerations on Representative Government*, p. 298.



The revolution of 1848, unsuccessful in its national purpose, prepared the subsequent victories of nationality in two ways. The first of these was the restoration of the Austrian power in Italy, with a new and more energetic centralisation, which gave no promise of freedom. Whilst that system prevailed, the right was on the side of the national aspirations, and they were revived in a more complete and cultivated form by Manin. The policy of the Austrian government, which failed during the ten years of the reaction to convert the tenure by force into a tenure by right, and to establish with free institutions the condition of allegiance, gave a negative encouragement to the theory. It deprived Francis Joseph of all active support and sympathy in 1859; for he was more clearly wrong in his conduct than his enemies in their doctrines. The real cause of the energy which the national theory has acquired is, however, the triumph of the democratic principle in France, and its recognition by the European powers. The theory of nationality is involved in the democratic theory of the sovereignty of the general will. "One hardly knows what any division of the human race should be free to do, if not to determine with which of the various collective bodies of human beings they choose to associate themselves."<sup>4</sup> It is by this act that a nation constitutes itself. To have a collective will, unity is necessary; and independence is requisite in order to assert it. Unity and nationality are still more essential to the notion of the sovereignty of the people than the cashiering of monarchs, or the revocation of laws. Arbitrary acts of this kind may be prevented by the happiness of the people, or the popularity of the king; but a nation inspired by the democratic idea cannot with consistency allow a part of itself to belong to a foreign state, or the whole to be divided into several native states. The theory of nationality therefore proceeds from both the principles which divide the political world,—from legitimacy, which ignores its claims, and from the revolution, which assumes them; and for the same reason it is the chief weapon of the last against the first.

In pursuing the outward and visible growth of the national theory, we are prepared for an examination of its political character and value. The absolutism which has created it denies equally that absolute right of national unity which is a product of democracy, and that claim of national liberty which belongs to the theory of freedom. These two views of nationality, corresponding to the French and to the English systems, are connected in name only, and are in reality the

<sup>4</sup> Mill's *Considerations*, p. 296.

opposite extremes of political thought. In one case, nationality is founded on the perpetual supremacy of the collective will, of which the unity of the nation is the necessary condition, to which every other influence must defer, and against which no obligation enjoys authority, and all resistance is tyrannical. The nation is here an ideal unit founded on the race, in defiance of the modifying action of external causes, of tradition, and of existing rights. It overrules the rights and wishes of the inhabitants, absorbing their divergent interests in a fictitious unity; sacrifices their several inclinations and duties to the higher claim of nationality; and crushes all natural rights and all established liberties, for the purpose of vindicating itself.<sup>5</sup> Whenever a single definite object is made the supreme end of the state, be it the advantage of a class, the safety or the power of the country, the greatest happiness of the greatest number, or the support of any speculative idea, the state becomes for the time inevitably absolute. Liberty alone demands for its realisation the limitation of the public authority; for liberty is the only object which benefits all alike, and provokes no sincere opposition. In supporting the claims of national unity, governments must be subverted in whose title there is no flaw, and whose policy is beneficent and equitable, and subjects must be compelled to transfer their allegiance to an authority for which they have no attachment, and which may be practically a foreign domination.

Connected with this theory in nothing except in the common enmity of the absolute state, is the theory which represents nationality as an essential, but not a supreme, element in determining the forms of the state. It is distinguished from the other, because it tends to diversity and not to uniformity, to harmony and not to unity; because it aims not at an arbitrary change, but at careful respect for the existing conditions of political life; and because it obeys the laws and results of history, not the aspirations of an ideal future. While the theory of unity makes the nation a source of despotism and revolution, the theory of liberty regards it as the bulwark of self-government, and the foremost limit to the excessive power of the state. Private rights, which are sacrificed to the unity, are preserved by the union, of nations. No power can so efficiently resist the tendencies of centralisation, of corruption, and of absolutism, as that community

<sup>5</sup> "Le sentiment d'indépendance nationale est encore plus général et plus profondément gravé dans le cœur des peuples que l'amour d'une liberté constitutionnelle. Les nations les plus soumises au despotisme éprouvent ce sentiment avec autant de vivacité que les nations libres; les peuples les plus barbares le sentent même encore plus vivement que les nations policées." *L'Italie au Dix neuvième Siècle*, p. 148, Paris, 1821.



which is the vastest that can be included in a state, which imposes on its members a consistent similarity of character, interest, and opinion, and which arrests the action of the sovereign by the influence of a divided patriotism. The presence of different nations under the same sovereignty is similar in its effect to the independence of the Church in the state. It provides against the servility which flourishes under the shadow of a single authority, by balancing interests, multiplying associations, and giving to the subject the restraint and support of a combined opinion. In the same way it promotes independence, by forming definite groups of public opinion, and by affording a great source and centre of political sentiments, and of notions of duty not derived from the sovereign will. Liberty provokes diversity, and diversity preserves liberty by supplying the means of organisation. All those portions of law which govern the relations of men with each other, and regulate social life, are the varying result of national custom, and the creation of private society. In these things, therefore, the several nations will differ from each other; for they themselves have produced them, and they do not owe them to the state which rules them all. This diversity in the same state is a firm barrier against the intrusion of the government beyond the political sphere which is common to all, into the social department which escapes legislation and is ruled by spontaneous laws. This sort of interference is characteristic of an absolute government, and is sure to provoke a reaction, and finally a remedy. That intolerance of social freedom which is natural to absolutism, is sure to find a corrective in the national diversities, which no other force could so efficiently provide. The co-existence of several nations under the same state is a test, as well as the best security, of its freedom. It is also one of the chief instruments of civilisation; and, as such, it is in the natural and providential order, and indicates a state of greater advancement than the national unity which is the ideal of modern liberalism.

The combination of different nations in one state is as necessary a condition of civilised life as the combination of men in society. Inferior races are raised by living in political union with races intellectually superior. Exhausted and decaying nations are revived by the contact of a younger vitality. Nations in which the elements of organisation and the capacity for government have been lost, either through the demoralising influence of despotism, or the disintegrating action of democracy, are restored and educated anew under the discipline of a stronger and less corrupted race. This

fertilising and regenerating process can only be obtained by living under one government. It is in the cauldron of the state that the fusion takes place by which the vigour, the knowledge, and the capacity of one portion of mankind may be communicated to another. Where political and national boundaries coincide, society ceases to advance, and nations relapse into a condition corresponding to that of men who renounce intercourse with their fellow-men. The difference between the two unites mankind not only by the benefits it confers on those who live together, but because it connects society either by a political or a national bond, gives to every people an interest in its neighbours, either because they are under the same government or because they are of the same race, and thus promotes the interests of humanity, of civilisation, and of religion.

Christianity rejoices at the mixture of races, as paganism identifies itself with their differences, because truth is universal, and errors various and particular. In the ancient world idolatry and nationality went together, and the same term is applied in Scripture to both. It was the mission of the Church to overcome national differences. The period of her undisputed supremacy was that in which all Western Europe obeyed the same laws, all literature was contained in one language, and the political unity of Christendom was personified in a single potentate, while its intellectual unity was represented in one university. As the ancient Romans concluded their conquests by carrying away the gods of the conquered people, Charlemagne overcame the national resistance of the Saxons only by the forcible destruction of their pagan rites. Out of the medieval period, and the combined action of the German race and the Church, came forth a new system of nations, and a new conception of nationality. Nature was overcome in the nation as well as in the individual. In pagan and uncultivated times, nations were distinguished from each other by the widest diversity, not only in religion, but in customs, language, and character. Under the new law they had many things in common; the old barriers which separated them were removed, and the new principle of self-government, which Christianity imposed, enabled them to live together under the same authority, without necessarily losing their cherished habits, their customs, or their laws. The new idea of freedom made room for different races in one state. A nation was no longer what it had been to the ancient world,—the progeny of a common ancestor, or the aboriginal product of a particular region,—a result of merely physical and material causes,—but a



moral and political being ; not the creation of geographical or physiological unity, but developed in the course of history by the action of the state. It is derived from the state, not supreme over it. A state may in course of time produce a nationality ; but that a nationality should constitute a state is contrary to the nature of modern civilisation. The nation derives its rights and its power from the memory of a former independence.

The Church has agreed in this respect with the tendency of political progress, and discouraged wherever she could the isolation of nations ; admonishing them of their duties to each other, and regarding conquest and feudal investiture as the natural means of raising barbarous or sunken nations to a higher level. But though she has never attributed to national independence an immunity from the accidental consequences of feudal law, of hereditary claims, or of testamentary arrangements, she defends national liberty against uniformity and centralisation, with an energy inspired by perfect community of interests. For the same enemy threatens both ; and the state which is reluctant to tolerate differences, and to do justice to the peculiar character of various races, must from the same cause interfere in the internal government of religion. The connection of religious liberty with the emancipation of Poland or Ireland is not merely the accidental result of local causes ; and the failure of the Concordat to unite the subjects of Austria is the natural consequence of a policy which did not desire to protect the provinces in their diversity and autonomy, and sought to bribe the Church by favours, instead of strengthening her by independence. From this influence of religion in modern history has proceeded a new definition of patriotism.

The difference between nationality and the state is exhibited in the nature of patriotic attachment. Our connection with the race is merely natural or physical, whilst our duties to the political nation are ethical. One is a community of affections and instincts infinitely important and powerful in savage life, but pertaining more to the animal than to the civilised man ; the other is an authority governing by laws, imposing obligations, and giving a moral sanction and character to the natural relations of society. Patriotism is in political life what faith is in religion, and it stands to the domestic feelings and to homesickness as faith to fanaticism and to superstition. It has one aspect derived from private life and nature ; for it is an extension of the family affections, as the tribe is an extension of the family. But in its real political character, patriotism consists in the development of

the instinct of self-preservation into a moral duty which may involve self-sacrifice. Self-preservation is both an instinct and a duty, natural and involuntary in one respect, and at the same time a moral obligation. By the first it produces the family; by the last, the state. If the nation could exist without the state, subject only to the instinct of self-preservation, it would be incapable of denying, controlling, or sacrificing itself; it would be an end and a rule to itself. But in the political order moral purposes are realised, and public ends are pursued, to which private interests and even existence must be sacrificed. The great sign of true patriotism, the development of selfishness into sacrifice, is the product of political life. That sense of duty which is supplied by race is not entirely separated from its selfish and instinctive basis; and the love of country, like married love, stands at the same time on a material and a moral foundation. The patriot must distinguish between the two causes or objects of his devotion. The attachment which is given only to the country is like obedience given only to the state—a submission to physical influences. The man who prefers his country before every other duty shows the same spirit as the man who surrenders every right to the state. They both deny that right is superior to authority. There is a moral and political country, in the language of Burke, distinct from the geographical, which may be possibly in collision with it. The Frenchmen who bore arms against the Convention were as patriotic as the Englishmen who bore arms against King Charles; for they recognised a higher duty than that of obedience to the actual sovereign. “In an address to France,” said Burke, “in an attempt to treat with it, or in considering any scheme at all relative to it, it is impossible we should mean the geographical, we must always mean the moral and political, country. . . . The truth is, that France is out of itself—the moral France is separated from the geographical. The master of the house is expelled, and the robbers are in possession. If we look for the corporate people of France, existing as corporate in the eye and intention of public law (that corporate people, I mean, who are free to deliberate and to decide, and who have a capacity to treat and conclude), they are in Flanders, and Germany, in Switzerland, Spain, Italy, and England. There are all the princes of the blood, there are all the orders of the state, there are all the parliaments of the kingdom. . . . I am sure that if half that number of the same description were taken out of this country, it would leave hardly any thing that I should call the people of England.”<sup>6</sup> Rousseau draws nearly the same distinction

<sup>6</sup> Burke's *Remarks on the Policy of the Allies*,—Works, v. 26, 29, 30.



between the country to which we happen to belong, and that which fulfils towards us the political functions of the state. In the *Emile* he has a sentence, of which it is not easy in a translation to convey the point: "Qui n'a pas une patrie a du moins un pays." And in his tract on Political Economy he writes: "How shall men love their country, if it is nothing more for them than for strangers, and bestows on them only that which it can refuse to none?" It is in the same sense he says further on, "La patrie ne peut subsister sans la liberté."<sup>7</sup>

The nationality formed by the state, then, is the only one to which we owe political duties, and it is therefore the only one which has political rights. The Swiss are ethnologically either French, Italian, or German; but no nationality has the slightest claim upon them, except the purely political nationality of Switzerland. The Tuscan or the Neapolitan state has formed a nationality; but the citizens of Florence and of Naples have no political community with each other. There are other states which have neither succeeded in absorbing distinct races in a political nationality, nor in separating a particular district from a larger nation. Austria and Mexico are instances on the one hand, Parma and Baden on the other. The progress of civilisation deals hardly with the last description of states. In order to maintain their integrity, they must attach themselves by confederations, or family alliances, to greater powers, and thus lose something of their independence. Their tendency is to isolate and shut off their inhabitants, to narrow the horizon of their views, and to dwarf in some degree the proportions of their ideas. Public opinion cannot maintain its liberty and purity in such small dimensions, and the currents that come from larger communities sweep over a contracted territory. In a small and homogeneous population there is hardly room for a natural classification of society, or for inner groups of interests that set bounds to sovereign power. The government and the subjects contend with borrowed weapons. The resources of the one, and the aspirations of the other, are derived from some external source; and the consequence is that the country becomes the instrument and the scene of contests in which

<sup>7</sup> Œuvres, ii. 717, i. 593, 595. Bossuet, in a passage of great beauty, on the love of country, does not attain to the political definition of the word. "La société humaine demande qu'on aime la terre où l'on habite ensemble, on la regarde comme une mère et une nourrice commune. . . . Les hommes en effet se sentent liés par quelque chose de fort, lorsqu'ils songent, que la même terre qui les a portés et nourris étant vivants, les recevra dans son sein quand ils seront morts." *Politique tirée de l'Écriture Sainte*,—Œuvres, x. 317.

it is not interested. These states, like the minuter communities of the Middle Ages, serve a purpose, by constituting partitions and securities of self-government in the larger states; but they are impediments to the progress of society, which depends on the mixture of races under the same governments.

The vanity and peril of national claims founded on no political tradition, but on race alone, appear in Mexico. There the races are divided by blood, without being grouped together in different regions. It is therefore neither possible to unite them, nor to convert them into the elements of an organised state. They are fluid, shapeless, and unconnected, and cannot be precipitated, or formed into the basis of political institutions. As they cannot be used by the state, they cannot be recognised by it; and their peculiar qualities, capabilities, passions, and attachments, are of no service, and therefore obtain no regard. They are necessarily ignored, and are therefore perpetually outraged. From this difficulty of races with political pretensions but without political position, the Eastern world escaped by the institution of castes. Where there are only two races, there is the resource of slavery; but when different races inhabit the different territories of an empire composed of several smaller states, it is of all possible combinations the most favourable to the establishment of a highly-developed system of freedom. In Austria there are two circumstances which add to the difficulty of the problem, but also increase its importance. The several nationalities are at very unequal degrees of advancement, and there is no single nation which is so predominant as to overwhelm or absorb the others. These are the conditions necessary for the very highest degree of organisation which government is capable of receiving. They supply the greatest variety of intellectual resource; the perpetual incentive to progress, which is afforded not merely by competition, but by the spectacle of a more advanced people; the most abundant elements of self-government, combined with the impossibility for the state to rule all by its own will; and the fullest security for the preservation of local customs and ancient rights. In such a country as this, liberty would achieve its most glorious results, while centralisation and absolutism would be destruction.

The problem presented to the government of Austria is higher than that which is solved in England, because of the necessity of admitting the national claims. The parliamentary system fails to provide for them, as it presupposes the unity of the people. Hence in those countries in which different races dwell together, it has not satisfied their desires,



and is regarded as an imperfect form of freedom. It brings out more clearly than before the differences it does not recognise, and thus continues the work of the old absolutism, and appears as a new phase of centralisation. In those countries, therefore, the power of the imperial parliament must be limited as jealously as the power of the crown, and many of its functions must be discharged by provincial diets, and a descending series of local authorities.

The great importance of nationality in the state consists in the fact that it is the basis of political capacity. The character of a nation determines in great measure the form and vitality of the state. Certain political habits and ideas belong to particular nations, and they vary with the course of the national history. A people just emerging from barbarism, a people effete from the excesses of a luxurious civilisation, cannot possess the means of governing itself; a people devoted to equality, or to absolute monarchy, is incapable of producing an aristocracy; a people averse to the institution of private property is without the first element of freedom. Each of these can be converted into efficient members of a free community only by the contact of a superior race, in whose power will lie the future prospects of the state. A system which ignores these things, and does not rely for its support on the character and aptitude of the people, does not intend that they should administer their own affairs, but that they should simply be obedient to the supreme command. The denial of nationality, therefore, implies the denial of political liberty.

The greatest adversary of the rights of nationality is the modern theory of nationality. By making the state and the nation commensurate with each other in theory, it reduces practically to a subject condition all other nationalities that may be within the boundary. It cannot admit them to an equality with the ruling nation which constitutes the state, because the state would then cease to be national, which would be a contradiction of the principle of its existence. According, therefore, to the degree of humanity and civilisation in that dominant body which claims all the rights of the community, the inferior races are exterminated, or reduced to servitude, or outlawed, or put in a condition of dependence.

If we take the establishment of liberty for the realisation of moral duties to be the end of civil society, we must conclude that those states are substantially the most perfect which, like the British and Austrian empires, include various distinct nationalities without oppressing them. Those

in which no mixture of races has occurred are imperfect; and those in which its effects have disappeared are decrepit. A state which is incompetent to satisfy different races condemns itself; a state which labours to neutralise, to absorb, or to expel them, destroys its own vitality; a state which does not include them is destitute of the chief basis of self-government. The theory of nationality, therefore, is a retrograde step in history. It is the most advanced form of the revolution, and must retain its power to the end of the revolutionary period, of which it announces the approach. Its great historical importance depends on two chief causes.

First, it is a chimera. The settlement at which it aims is impossible. As it can never be satisfied and exhausted, and always continues to assert itself, it prevents the government from ever relapsing into the condition which provoked its rise. The danger is too threatening, and the power over men's minds too great, to allow any system to endure which justifies the resistance of nationality. It must contribute, therefore, to obtain that which in theory it condemns,—the liberty of different nationalities as members of one sovereign community. This is a service which no other force could accomplish; for it is a corrective alike of absolute monarchy, of democracy, and of constitutionalism, as well as of the centralisation which is common to all three. Neither the monarchical, nor the revolutionary, nor the parliamentary system can do this; and all the ideas which have excited enthusiasm in past times are impotent for the purpose, except nationality alone.

And secondly, the national theory marks the end of the revolutionary doctrine, and its logical exhaustion. In proclaiming the supremacy of the rights of nationality, the system of democratic equality goes beyond its own extreme boundary, and falls into contradiction with itself. Between the democratic and the national phase of the revolution, socialism had intervened, and had already carried the consequences of the principle to an absurdity. But that phase was passed. The revolution survived its offspring, and produced another further result. Nationality is more advanced than socialism, because it is a more arbitrary system. The social theory endeavours to provide for the existence of the individual, beneath the terrible burdens which modern society heaps upon labour. It is not merely a development of the notion of equality, but a refuge from real misery and starvation. However false the solution, it was a reasonable demand that the poor should be saved from destruction; and if the freedom of the state was sacrificed to the safety of the



individual, the more immediate object was, at least in theory, attained. But nationality does not aim either at liberty or prosperity, both of which it sacrifices to the imperative necessity of making the nation the mould and measure of the state. Its course will be marked with material as well as moral ruin, in order that a new invention may prevail over the works of God and the interests of mankind. There is no principle of change, no phase of political speculation conceivable, more comprehensive, more subversive, or more arbitrary than this. It is a confutation of democracy, because it sets limits to the exercise of the popular will, and substitutes for it a higher principle. It prevents not only the division, but the extension of the state, and forbids to terminate war by conquest, and to obtain a security for peace. Thus, after surrendering the individual to the collective will, the revolutionary system makes the collective will subject to conditions which are independent of it; and rejects all law, only to be controlled by an accident.

Although, therefore, the theory of nationality is more absurd and more criminal than the theory of socialism, it has an important mission in the world, and marks the final conflict, and therefore the end, of two forces which are the worst enemies of civil freedom,—the absolute monarchy, and the revolution.

---

## THE CONSERVATIVE REACTION.

[COMMUNICATED.]

MEN will differ about the extent, the tendencies, and the worth of the Conservative reaction which we all see to be taking place in the country, according to the different ideas which they attach to the word "Conservative" and to the word "reaction."

"Conservative" and "Liberal" are good terms, well fitted to express political tendencies and doctrines which are excellent in themselves, and not incompatible with each other. But they have been usurped and misused, the one by the Tories, the other by the Radicals and spurious Whigs, till they have almost lost their right meaning. They do not properly belong to parties, but to political philosophies; though, for convenience, the name "Conservative Reaction" may be employed for that complicated change in the social and political feeling of the country, and in the relations of persons and parties in Parliament, which constitutes in this country the political phenomenon of the day.

The word "reaction" is no less indefinite. It is a first axiom of mechanics that one force can only be counteracted by another; and that to stop a moving body, much more to turn it back, requires an equal or greater force than that which gave the first motion. But the axioms of mechanics do not always hold good for the moral world. The forces of mind and will are liable to another kind of reaction, which seems a consequence, not of a counteracting force, but of a failure of force, of slumber or lethargy. Moral force grows weaker, sometimes by the friction and opposition of external objects,—which sometimes, on the contrary, excite it to stronger action,—but more usually by the weariness, faintness, and death of the subject wherein it resides. The Conservative reaction, then, may be caused by the growth of a real counteracting force, or it may be only a lethargy of the force which has hitherto been in action. Or, as a third alternative, it may be a compound of both, and due partly to an awakening of Conservative opinion, and partly to the internal decay and dissolution of Liberal thought.

The reaction is scarcely one caused by any great increase of energy in the opposition. If the old momentum were not weakened in itself, but only held in check and brought to a stand-still by the clash of a new one, the country would be alive with the tokens of an intense political struggle. The



dead-lock would be caused by the equality of the two parties hauling at the two ends of the rope. Though neither stirred, their muscles would be all screwed up, and the rope would be pulled tight. It would be a case of great labour expended in doing little. But we see nothing of the kind; there is no token of struggle; men's muscles are relaxed, the rope hangs loose; and there is evident every where rather an economy than a waste of power.

The reaction, then, carries with it the signs of lack of energy or political interest, and of lethargy. But it may be questioned whether this apathy is not to be considered a real conservative force. As the growth of the body requires proportioned intervals of wakefulness and sleep, so does every mental growth require successive periods of restlessness and repose—the day to work, the night to consolidate the day's work. In the moral world the present hangs partly on the past, partly on what is coming. It gives the rule to hope and to memory by turns. Sometimes it rests in enjoyment of what it has already got; sometimes it strives to get what lies beyond. Sometimes its politics are conservative, sometimes liberal. So it goes through its appointed course of day and night, of spring and winter, gradually accumulating the fruit of its harvests in a rich soil of customs and traditions.

We shall see further on how these two views of the reaction, as a morbid lethargy and as a healthy repose, influence the politics of the two philosophic statesmen of the great parliamentary parties. At present I propose to consider it in connection with persons and parties in Parliament, and with social and political ideas in the country.

I. The permanence, the tactics, and the aims of our parliamentary parties are always influenced by the personal qualities of the statesmen by whom those parties are led. Of these qualities the most important is that which determines the school of statecraft to which the statesman belongs. We may divide these schools into the doctrinaire, the diplomatic, and that of the adventurers. The statesman of the first school devotes himself to a political theory; of the second to the general advantage of the state; while the adventurer serves his own interests.

The doctrinaires have a political system logically developed and consistently pursued, to which, on occasion, they postpone public considerations and private advantage. They are of many kinds. The idealist doctrinaire builds his system on an abstract principle, which he generalises into a rigid law. Such were Rousseau, Sieyès, Bentham, St. Simon, Owen, and Proudhon. They cannot be considered statesmen at all, but only visionaries and theorists. The practical doctrinaire does

not omit from his calculation the actual laws and institutions of society and of the state, but developes the national growth upon this foundation, or upon some part of it. If his guiding principle is a political idea, he is a philosophical statesman,—a doctrinaire in the best sense of the word. If it is an interest, not of the state, but of society, he is an economist or philanthropist. If it is an interest of a particular class, he must take his name from the class of which he is the advocate.

The philosophical politician, or doctrinaire, who would develop the state upon a political idea or principle, is weak as a statesman on account of his infidelity to party. His doctrinal consistency supersedes particular interests, and he is therefore unable to devote himself either to bringing a party into power, or to serving the interests of a class. No one definite object or particular measure can be the supreme aim upon which all his efforts are concentrated. On the contrary, he developes on every side at once the consequences of his principle, letting it work now in favour of one side, and now of the other, till he loses the confidence of both. Hence he cannot become the centre of a party, and he is deficient in practical energy, in organisation, in combination. Parties do not follow men who care for truths more than for advantages. They “ally themselves with genius, and follow the guidance of character.” They demand for their leader “a man of stable mind,” and hate many-sidedness. It can only be on very rare occasions that the social enthusiasm of a country makes it more devoted to an idea than to profit. Doctrinaires, moreover, are scientific politicians. But since it is impossible that a number of men should independently pursue a long train of original thought, and yet remain in perfect accord and consistency one with another, they do not long agree together. They can only enter into temporary organisations. When they come into power and ally themselves with a fixed party, they are apt, after achieving a part of their designs, to become inflexible and stationary, because of their want of skill to modify and adapt their principle to the existing circumstances. M. Guizot and Stahl are types of this kind of doctrinaire. So is Lord Stanley, who has belief in certain principles and great knowledge of details, but hardly mental energy enough to work out a system in which the principles and the details are brought into combination. Hence he is obstinate in his ideas, and a good man of business ; but he is not master of a policy, nor always consistent with himself. Mr. Gladstone stands in the same division, but on a higher level. In his practical measures he exhibits a straightforward, intelligible, and simple statesmanship ; but in his speeches, in his principles, and sometimes in his votes, he shows a many-sidedness and comprehen-



siveness too mercurial to be grasped by ordinary politicians, who consider him to be a parliamentary Erasmus, a dealer in phrases, unfaithful to both parties alike, and never to be relied on by those with whom he acts. All this is closely connected with his school of statesmanship. It is congruous for a doctrinaire to be conscientious and scrupulous; as truthful in displaying his present thought as he is versatile in doubting to-day what he believed yesterday; incapable of moral passion, but resolute in holding the House of Commons to that which it has once resolved; unfurnished with that instinctive divination which foresees where the knot of a political tangle must be cut, but dogmatic about the right course to be pursued; politically committed to the Establishment, though he may suspect its ecclesiastical authority; and politically opposed to Catholicism, though he certainly respects its doctrines. But by this character Mr. Gladstone gives offence to all sections by turns, while it prevents him from really conciliating any. Some are jealous of his genius, some dislike his principles, some are scandalised at his seeming inconsistencies, all dread his pugnacity, and none can trust the permanence of his alliance.

Those half-doctrinaires whose system is based, not on a political idea, but on a social or class interest,—the economists, philanthropists, and class-champions,—are personally as disinterested as the philosophical politicians, and much above them in their value as party men. They are good organisers, energetic, definite in purpose, and they seldom object to the employment of despotic or revolutionary means to obtain their ends. Of this kind are the Catholic statesmen who take the interests of the Church as their basis; such are M. de Montalembert, and Donoso Cortes, who have worked out two contrary systems from the same principle. Some found their systems on industrial interests, like Mr. Bright. The importance of these statesmen depends solely upon the power of the class which they serve, and from which they generally take their name.

Those politicians who serve the state and the public without any exclusive devotion to a special doctrine or class may be called the diplomatists, from the nursery in which most of them are bred. Diplomacy is an art which deals with no principles, and is never directed to mere individual profit. It looks to the interest, the honour, and the advantage of the state, of the country, and of the people, without being the champion of a political doctrine, such as constitutionalism, or of a private or social interest, such as religion or cotton. In this school statesmen become consummate pilots to steer the ship of the state. But as they have learned to love no prin-

ciple, so they originate no great reforms, pursue no remote ideal, and seldom persevere in a path that requires sacrifices. While Tories cling to existing interests, and Radicals neglect facts for aspirations, these diplomatists go on with the world, like practised walkers in crowded streets, not at all slower, and not much faster, than the other wayfarers. They keep their speed a little over the average, because it is pleasanter to push than to be pushed, and because they see a little farther ahead than their neighbours. They readily accommodate themselves to circumstances; gaily spread their sails to every wind; and care little whither they are driven, provided they can finish their voyage without accident or disaster. Such men are very popular at times, when they seem to be the only pilots who can steer the ship through the rocks and sands. But when the danger is over, their popularity quickly wanes; for they have no party behind them, but only their personal followers, and they represent no principle or interest by which bodies of men can be permanently held together. Too respectable to be guided simply by their interests, these diplomatic statesmen have neither philosophy enough for doctrinaires, nor devotion enough for party leaders. But they are generally distinguished for their cleverness and tact. Lord Palmerston and Talleyrand are types of the class. Lord Russell is a less striking instance; he is a better partisan, because he has more devotion to doctrines, and his cleverness seems less because it is not always separated from principle. But in the other two nothing but cleverness is ever seen; there is no intrusion of fixed dogma or principle at all. Hence their straightforwardness, their brilliancy, the absence of all embarrassment arising from the necessity of harmonising conflicting principles, their coolness, and their confidence. Lord Palmerston is never dull in stating a truth, or unskilful in getting out of a difficulty. He has no theorems to solve, but only problems to perform. He is an advocate retained by the state to win its cause in a given action. This explains his old foreign policy, which gained him the name of the Captain Rock of Europe, and which consisted in keeping up incessant diplomatic contests with the representatives of other powers, for the purpose of promoting a temporary English interest. His personal temperament has given much of its tone to his political career. In this he resembles Metternich, who began on the same foundation, but was led by his intellectual torpor and indolence, and by his aristocratic cosiness and content, to crystallise his *raison-d'état* into a system of immobility. Lord Palmerston's policy is as personal and instinctive as his conduct in the House of Commons. There his bulldog-like fidelity to his friends loses all its generosity, when



contrasted with his cowardly conduct towards his adversaries ; for it is cowardice respectfully to spare the strong, while he triumphantly crushes the weak, seizes the opportunity of a temporary unpopularity to overwhelm an opponent with banter and ridicule, and hits those hardest who have fewest friends. In the same way, in politics, his ardent patriotism seems to lose its generosity when it is contrasted with his treatment of foreign countries ; for he bullies the weak, and is subservient to the strong. An admirable advocate in the international law-court, he is utterly careless of the principles of jurisprudence, and ignorant of any philosophy on which he might found a general international and domestic policy. On social questions he is sceptical, unable to see the political bearing of social passions ; indifferent to religious interests, but faithful to those of the class to which he belongs. Mr. Gladstone's versatility is that of an intellect perpetually discovering fresh reasons ; Lord Palmerston's is the versatility of a man who does not reason, but always sees how to act. The manifest utility of his expedients absolves him from the charge of infidelity to party, and makes the same acts popular when done by him which are unpopular when done or advised by Mr. Gladstone. The members of the opposition like him, and think him a Conservative because he sometimes flatters the worst Tory instincts. The ministerialists consider him a Liberal, chiefly on account of his radical and revolutionary foreign policy. His "bad parts all together" maintain "so politic a state of evil," that the House of Commons is content to play Beatrice to his Benedick,—to render railing for railing, but to make up its quarrels at last, and to promise love and obedience till death parts them. Thus he is strong precisely because he is wrong. Those who dislike him tolerate him because he is cheerful and wounds no pride, and because he is old and excites no envy. In this way his personal influence keeps the Government together.

In this diplomatic class of politicians we must reckon those whose patriotism is contented to serve a transitory cause, and to work for some one measure, without advocating any political system on which this measure may be based, or of which it forms part. Such politicians ought to take their names from the measure which they advocate. O'Connell was the emancipator ; Wilberforce the abolitionist ; Mr. Spooner and Mr. Whalley are the no-Popery champions ; and the O'Donoghue is the prophet of repeal. "Independent oppositionists," who oppose all governments that will not support a given measure, belong to this class, unless their conduct condemns them to the next.

The last class of statesmen, the adventurers, may comprehend men with or without political system, provided they agree in this one point, that their real foundation is their own personal interest. These are a dissolving element in the state, useful, and even needful, whenever there are abuses and grievances that want breaking up. For this purpose the statesmen who serve their own interests are often excellent instruments, because they are bound by nothing, neither by traditions, nor by obligations, nor by prejudices. Hence they have a peculiar facility in rationalising politics, and in removing social superstition. States sometimes stand in need of such a purification; and the people can scarcely perform it for themselves, for the generality of men are governed by attachments, habits, and unreasoning motives. When the process is to be performed, the adventurer who has to do it can take his choice between two methods. He may either openly set himself up against received opinions, disturb the popular mind, and break down its old belief, not in order to put a new belief into its place,—that is out of the question, and if it were to be done, he would not be the man to do it,—but to substitute passions for the old belief; or else he may devote himself to keeping alive in the masses a superstition which he does not share, professing to sympathise with their credulity and selfishness, and hypocritically clothing himself in the garment of their obscurantism. There is no third alternative; he cannot pursue the normal progress of things, and unselfishly follow a principle. Personally as well as politically, that which he hates most is the man who is loyal to principles and who is led by doctrine. This is the only power which can dissolve his combinations, and the only intelligence which can fully understand the basis of his conduct.

The politicians who choose the first of these methods are demagogues and revolutionists, like Danton and Wilkes. Of the others, Mr. Disraeli is so perfect an instance that he may almost be considered their archetype. The one thing which he has ever hated is the doctrine of the old Whigs. He began by attacking it as a Radical, and now he attacks it as a Tory. But though he has adopted all the cant of Toryism, and can utter its commonplaces about no-Popery and resistance to reform as glibly as the sincerest of the party, he does not really believe in it, nor does he defend its excesses. So he is the very man to lead the party into liberal concession. Peel failed in this attempt, because he had constituted his party on a doctrine, and for the purpose of carrying out a policy. In giving up this policy, he not only sacrificed the interests of his party, but destroyed the very basis on which it was founded,



and therefore separated it from him for ever. But Mr. Disraeli endeavours to constitute a party out of a number of detached interests and fragments of principles, each of which has a place in his programme, and a legitimate demand upon him. The mere fusion together of such heterogeneous elements implies the dissolution of many prejudices. Each must give up much before a compromise can be made among all. Concession, Liberal or Radical as it happens, becomes a basis, not of his policy, for he has none, but of his party, because it is one of the conditions by which his party exists. For this reason, he will not destroy but rather consolidate his party by such concessions. This party has no other means of coming into power than by alliances with the unattached sects of politicians, and no other means of making them than the employment of a political adventurer for the purpose. Thus Mr. Disraeli is necessary to his party; and his party is necessary to him, because among the ministerialists as a body he could never obtain an equal following. The Tories were ever more liberal than the Whigs in rewarding the parliamentary talent of self-made men. The Whig aristocracy required from them such pledges of conservatism and of stability as not even a Burke could give, far less a man whom they consider an alien from England as much in feeling as in blood. The Whigs use men of intellect and learning, rather as tools than as allies, and rather as allies than as leaders. This is enough to repel a new man whose principles are weaker than his interests, and to drive him for ever into the arms of the Tories. Moreover, Mr. Disraeli, or some equivalent politician, is necessary to the state. Abuses exist which call loudly for his dissolving virus. Irish reforms have been made, not for the good of Ireland, but to give a little longer lease to the crowning iniquity,—the Irish Establishment. Hence their benefit has been only temporary and partial; in some instances their gentle pruning has only made agitation vegetate more vigorously. But the work cannot be well done by the Tories; they would spoil their reforms as they did Emancipation, on which they left their trail in the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders, and in the Catholic oath. But if the Irish Establishment is to be destroyed, it cannot be done in the teeth of the Tories without a revolution. The force of their prejudices must be undermined by some one to whom they will listen. On the other hand, the very existence of a Tory government, only possible under such an adventurer as Mr. Disraeli, would soon bring the Irish Church into the first rank of political questions. The Whigs, while in office, forget its flagrant iniquity in presence of the difficulty of dealing with it, but out of office they become most industrious agi-

tators against it; and in Ireland itself the degradation<sup>n</sup> of Protestant ascendancy is much more severely felt while the Tories are in power than under the Whigs, and the agitation against it becomes a social as well as a political necessity.

II. Such are the personal elements of the reaction, so far as it shows itself in the House of Commons. We come next to its connection with the balance of parties. Here the striking phenomena are the dissolution of the ministerialist party, and the attempt of Mr. Disraeli to reconstruct a Tory party, by the agglutination of fragments detached from its opponents.

The nucleus round which the ministerialist atoms have hitherto clustered has lost much of its attractive force, and the party is consequently in a loose state of aggregation. This is in part a consequence of the unphilosophical character of the last half century in all moral or political subjects, and its concentration of thought on physical science. Policy, becoming undoctinated, has aimed at individual results instead of working out general principles. Whenever a measure has been seen to be inevitable, on account of the pressure from below, party contests have resolved themselves into a race to try who could catch it, seal it with his seal, and fashion it for his own interests. Liberal bills have been brought in by the Tories, merely to enable them to say that popular measures were passed by Conservative majorities. These measures have been maimed by the want of intelligence in their framers, or defiled by their want of honesty. The Whigs have ceased to be creators, and have only dealt with the ephemeral interests and popular ideas which were imposed upon them under pain of dismissal. The two parties have scrambled for the honour of directing a policy equally opposed to the principles professed by both. Their leaders have been restrained neither by Burke's regard for principle, nor by Peel's for consistency, from offering themselves, like attorneys, to carry out contrary policies in successive sessions. The Tories and self-styled Conservatives, under Mr. Disraeli, were willing to outbid the Whigs in democratic concessions to reform. Those who called themselves Liberals were ready, under Lord Palmerston, to obstruct all reform whatever. They all lived from hand to mouth, took little thought for the future, and were contented to work for a series of unconnected objects necessarily presented to them. They had not the true statesmanship of presiding principles and prolific energy. Their policy was determined by the last state of the poll, and by the cries of the hustings. Thus the foundations of party have been sapped. For a party thus constituted has lost all reason for existing a moment after the object of its search has been obtained. It is thenceforth, like the Anti-Corn-Law League after the repeal of



the corn-laws, an instrument with no work to do. Its victory is its dissolution. Like a fire-work, it is made to go off once, and then finish. Under such a system, as soon as the immediate business of the session is done, the House of Commons becomes an unorganised multitude, whose movements are uncertain, and whose cohesion cannot be counted on.

The Whigs are most to blame for this, for they ought to be the theoretical politicians of progress and development. Their force used to consist in their principles. Their theory made them the philosophical statesmen of constitutional government. When Fox, dazzled by the speculations of the French revolutionists, led the new Whigs into his heresy, the old tradition passed to the Tories of the school of Grenville and Wellesley, and to those Whigs who remained faithful to the old creed,—Windham, Grattan, Mackintosh. But the great Whig party had lost its doctrinal tradition, and could thenceforth subsist no longer by its philosophy, nor by the general principles it once knew how to realise in practice, but only by taking up first one given business, Emancipation, and then another, Reform, and then another, Free-trade. After the accomplishment of each of these ends, the party was left like a steamer that has burnt out its coal, lying like a log on the waters, and looking out for a wind to carry it along. Combined only for a given practical end, it was exhausted by success; it had nothing further to do but to break up, and leave its fragments free to enter another temporary organisation, and to cluster round the nucleus of some new practical purpose or political theory. It was the political theory of the philosophic Liberals that was lately the attraction; and if the Whigs are beginning to fall away, it is not because the theory has been worked out,—it has still plenty to do in Ireland,—but because the Whigs and undogmatic Liberals, taught by foreign and domestic examples, have been frightened at what seem to be the ulterior aims of philosophic Liberalism. The nucleus has lost its attractive power, and the mass its cohesion. Indeed, the force which has hitherto kept the party together is now most active in disorganising it. For it cannot be doubted that the chief cause of the reaction among parliamentary parties has been the alliance, real or apparent, of the Liberals with the philosophic Radicals on questions of finance and foreign policy. In popular opinion, the copyright of free-trade belongs to Messrs. Bright, Cobden, Villiers, and Milner Gibson. They are the authors of the work; the followers of Peel and the Whigs are only its publishers. In the same way Mr. Cobden is regarded as the genius of the French treaty. Mr. Gladstone, the official expounder of free-trade and the French treaty in the House of Commons, is obliged to appear

more or less in the character of the lieutenant and agent of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright; and the mistake that naturally arises from this is strengthened by a recollection of Mr. Gladstone's commercial connections, and by his tendency to seek a commercial basis for his politics. This tendency, although it really differs in all essential points from Mr. Bright's, is easily confounded with it by people who are too idle, or otherwise unwilling, or unable, to do Mr. Gladstone justice. Hence he is the object of the particular hatred of the reactionists. Hence their deafness to his abjuration of Mr. Bright's political principles, and of all intention of "changing the system of taxation, shifting the burden from commodities to property, and effecting thereby a considerable alteration in the relative position of classes." Some of the reactionists have not yet relinquished the hope of saving the few rags that remain, if not of restoring some of what is lost, of protection. The example of America, full of warning on most other points, seems to give a hopeful token on this. All have a dislike of direct taxation, and a just dread of its exaggeration. Among these reactionists we do not count many gains from the old Liberal party. They comprise Tories of all calibres, from the blundering rudeness of Mr. Bentinck to the unphilosophical routine of Sir Stafford Northcote. But among them may be found such reasoners as Mr. Baring and Mr. Hubbard, and the rest of that group of City men who always oppose Mr. Gladstone's budgets.

The alliance of the Liberals with the Radicals in foreign policy has contributed an aristocratic element to the reaction. The aristocratic feeling of England was deeply engaged on the side of Austria in 1859. Aristocracy loves its kind; and the only real aristocracy, the only nobility that retains real political power on the continent of Europe, is that of Austria. Hence the leaning of our aristocracy is to deplore the defeat and the difficulties of Austria, and the progress of France and Piedmont, where the absence of an hereditary senate, and of primogeniture, makes the political constitution incompatible with real aristocracy, and therefore (in tendency) with differentiation of classes, and with constitutional freedom. The very strong and openly-expressed feeling of Lord Palmerston against Austria, and her great perplexities during the last three years, have raised this aristocratic sympathy to a degree far higher than it had reached while the Conservatives were in office. Lord Malmesbury has not risen with the tide; he still speaks his old language, cold and critical, towards Austria. But his abler under-secretary, Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald, has better comprehended the progress of the reaction. He knows that it is not confined to those who are aristocrats only through selfish interest. For as the distinction of classes



is the framework of liberty, and as the whole essence of aristocracy consists in this distinction, and cannot subsist without it, all sincere and enlightened friends of liberty must sympathise with Austria, not in her attempts to keep this or that possession, but in her endeavours to preserve her aristocratic constitution. Mr. Roebuck's speeches are a logical, however unexpected, instance of this reaction in the minds of philosophic Liberals. We find it also in the feelings of that coterie of old Whigs whom Mr. Bernal Osborne calls "the old gentlemen who go to bed at eleven o'clock," and who consider the Pope a very ill-used man; though the aristocratic and legitimist sympathy which in Mr. Roebuck is a logical development of political philosophy, is in them mainly a result of the identity of interests, and of the fellow-feelings of men of the same rank.

Since sympathy with Austria involves aversion from France, these persons are hostile to the French alliance, or the policy which seeks the safety of Europe in the hegemony of France and England combined; but the French treaty is on the one hand the most prominent result and symbol of the French alliance, as it is on the other Mr. Gladstone's favourite work, and the most complete exposition of his financial policy. It is therefore a point which the enemies of the French alliance, and of Mr. Gladstone's finance, can unite in attacking; and their combined opposition is most eminently represented by Mr. Horsman, an old Radical, now almost a Tory champion, who, however, knows more of politics than all the Tories together, and will never combine with Mr. Disraeli in recommending subservience to France in our foreign policy, or such a relaxation in the progress of our armaments as will leave us unable to exert our moral influence in Europe.

As Austria has been an attractive cause of reaction, so America has been a repulsive cause. The idea of the intimate connection of peace, cheapness of administration, and freedom, with democratic government has been rudely torn in pieces; one more example of the sure development of democracy into a military despotism has been given; the fatalistic acquiescence of Tocqueville's disciples in its inevitable advent has been shaken; its brutal disregard of law has been shown in the *Trent* affair; and the sympathies of its natural friends have been put to the sorest trial by the artificial cotton famine which it has created. The American States are now playing the part of the drunken Helot, and warning England to beware of the intoxication of democracy. Mr. Gregory is the best instance in the House of Commons of the influence exercised by this example. His speech against Reform in May 1860 was merely a relation of the experiences of his American

journey; but it was a compendium of the great argument by which Reform has been, for the time, so completely shelved.

The examples of France, of Italy, and to some extent of Hungary, when rightly understood, have no doubt the same tendency as that of America; but there is not the same efficacy in the lessons they teach. The vigorous unity of France, her external power, the prolonged duration of her present government, and the development of her resources, all conspire to veil her lack of liberty, and the evils of her despotic system. The Italian revolution does not to any great extent affect the reaction, except in the case of the Catholic members of the House of Commons. The Conservatives are not earnestly opposed to Italian unity, for they do not see in it the triumph of a democratic element, but only the consolidation of a strong monarchy, which will be of great weight in the balance of power. Many of them also feel a religious complacency in the downfall of the Papal government. Neither are the Radicals, as a body, more earnest for Italian unity than the Conservatives against it. Mr. Roebuck, the type of old Radicalism, is Austrian. Mr. Bright and his party have no particular care for the Italian cause. Hungary again, though in tendency it sides with the revolution, yet technically bases its rights on precedents and traditions that would satisfy the most fanatical Tory.

The alliance of Liberals and Radicals against church-rates has been another cause of reaction. The abolition of the rate has been asked for on principles which would put an end to tithes, and to the whole Establishment. It was known that the Liberation Society, which took a prominent part in the movement, had only for its proximate object the abolition of church-rates, while its ulterior purpose was the complete separation of Church and State. This has frightened away those Liberals who were only such in the interests of the Establishment, and has made them into reactionists. Together with the old defenders of church-rates, they constitute a party whose ecclesiastical conservatism is exactly on the model of Mr. Disraeli's political conservatism, because it sacrifices the internal unity, purity, and principles of the body it defends to its external preservation. The Established Church, as an element of our constitution, is aristocratic and conservative, intimately bound up with our hereditary nobility and crown. It is an organ of aristocratic influence upon the people, which would lose all its utility by being made subservient to the democracy. When it ceases to teach the people, as one having an authorised mission to instruct them, and consents to accept its mission and its doctrines from its flocks, it ceases to be aristocratic. Now the ground taken up by the Tories in defence of church-rates is one whereon it is im-



possible to defend the Establishment in its aristocratic and conservative character. "Dissenter and Churchman," they tell us, "have a common interest in the parish church; it is a building meant for common use, every one has a right to enter, no one can be thrust out; there all may hear the Bible read and morality taught. Ministers and laymen who obstruct the entrance to the church by too narrow views of her doctrines do not understand their trust. The true spirit and the true interest of the Church of England is comprehension, not exclusion." This is the same thing as to say, that if the masses will not rise to the level of her doctrines, she must condescend to the level of theirs; that she must disarm material opposition by abandoning her spiritual exclusiveness, and defend her parsonages by throwing her creeds out at the window. The analogy between such a combination, and Mr. Disraeli's reconstruction of a Conservative party at the expense of unity, consistency, and principle, could easily be shown.

Another element in the reaction comes from Ireland. The momentary preponderance of Italian over local interests, in the minds of the Irish Catholics, has made them desirous of punishing the Government, even though they might bring in the Tories in its room. Their attitude on the Italian revolution has drawn them nearer to the aristocratic and legitimist opponents of the French alliance, and has in the same proportion alienated their former friends, and made them suspect that the Catholics are at bottom hostile to liberty, and of a spirit alien to English institutions. Thus the old Protestant feeling against them has been strengthened on both sides of the House, but especially among the Liberals and Radicals. The Tory leaders, who, on purely political grounds, would naturally stand with Catholics like Sir George Bowyer or Mr. Hennessy, shrink from doing so, and leave it to the extravagant Tories of the second rank, such as Mr. Baillie Cochrane, to support them. But the deeper alienation of the Radicals is aptly symbolised by Mr. Whalley's inheritance of Mr. Spooner's old office, as anti-Maynooth champion. Mr. Whalley, who is an advanced Liberal, really represents an anti-Catholic movement, the motive power of which is in Italy, while its vibrations have shaken the opinions of many self-styled Liberals about the applicability of their principles to Catholics.

Thus the reaction within the House of Commons is at present a chaos of parties, which are only gradually finding their affinities for each other. Left to themselves, they would perhaps settle down in greater strength round the Tory than round the opposite centre. The reactionary currents, how-

ever, consist at present of too many different, and even contradictory, elements, and are too heterogeneous and eccentric in their courses, to unite in an attack against Government, in any more practical way than by an abstract resolution. Those who can agree in nothing else can often agree in this; but such an agreement is an unsafe basis for the construction of a ministry. An appeal to the country at the present day would probably result in a confirmation of Lord Palmerston's foreign policy, the only subject on which a real political interest is felt in the country. Hence the opponents of Government are very unwilling that such an appeal should be made till, in the course of nature, Reform, or some other question of domestic politics, comes once more to the surface, when the two rival parties may struggle on equal terms to get possession of it. In the mean time the policy of the Tories is to wait for the reaction in the House and in the country to ripen, to smother all extraneous interference, to keep every thing quiet, and to use every occasion that may occur for discrediting the present Government, until they can at last supplant it. On the other hand, the policy of the Ministerialists is to stir up political passions on the point where they feel themselves strong—their foreign policy; never to allow it to be forgotten, but to put it forward on all occasions, to call on the country to pronounce concerning it, and, as far as possible, to appeal to patriotic passions to justify their finance.

This idea of Tory policy has within the last nine months been too often set forth, both in and out of Parliament, to admit of any doubt of its reality. Lord Stanley, at King's Lynn, on the 22d of November, spoke of the "Conservative reaction" as a real thing, but inaccurately expressed, since a real "reaction" would tend to reverse the policy and legislation of the last thirty years. But such a counter-revolution as this he confessed to be impossible in England, where changes, once made, are always respected as new elements of the constitution. The reaction which he contemplates is one which does not restore the past, but hinders the present from going so fast. "Of conservative feeling," he says, "and contentment with that which we have, and of objection to any changes that may be proposed, there is undoubtedly more than at any time within my recollection." This feeling has its roots neither in the manœuvres of parties nor in domestic political controversies. "I do not believe," he says, "that it has any thing to do with the accidents of political combinations or the working of parliamentary parties." But he discovers the chief reasons of the reaction in those foreign complications to which the attention of politicians has of late been so exclusively directed. We have taken warning from the



despotic issue of the democratic revolution of 1848 ; from the unsatisfactory working of ultra-popular institutions in our colonies ; from the internal disunion of the great Continental states, which has called our attention to the existence of the elements of similar discord in England, as shown by the strikes. Still, though our interest in foreign politics has done us this service, he would not have us carry it too far ; to excite ourselves about it, and to give that excitement vent in debates, in or out of Parliament, he considers to be fraught with political danger, and to be contrary to our only possible foreign policy, that of non-intervention. But when these questions are at rest, there are no others of present political interest. We find ourselves in a kind of political Sabbath ; and he invites us to profit by the lull, and to take the opportunity to carry a mass of measures of administrative reform, to consolidate the statute law, and amend the law of patents, to facilitate the transfer of land, to reconstruct the Admiralty, to modify the military system of promotion by purchase, and to settle the education question, and that of church-rates. As to the financial policy of the Government, he approves of the French treaty, and the clearance of the customs, and has no great objection to the repeal of the duty on paper, though he thinks that it would have been better to reduce that on tea. But these questions he thinks to be purely administrative, and therefore non-political, and technical arrangements to be carried out by the permanent officials, rather than subjects of political warfare in Parliament.

And yet these " administrative " questions involve matter for the most dangerous political controversies. Behind state education there lurk the questions of centralisation, of the management of social interests by state functionaries, of the relative rights and duties of parents, the clergy, and the state, of education expurgated from religion or built upon it. Behind church-rates there lurk the controversies about the Establishment in Ireland, Scotland, and finally in England. With the French treaty there start up afresh the questions of the French alliance, and the other portions of our foreign policy ; with the repeal of customs and of the paper-duty there arise the controversies between protection and free-trade, and the balance of direct and indirect taxation.

The truth seems to be that Lord Stanley fears that his party, as at present organised, if it takes action at all on these points, will attempt to found a policy upon their unpopular and impossible side. Hence he tries to persuade it that they are merely administrative, not to be quarrelled over. He wishes it to temporise, to keep calm, and to reserve its strength for the real political struggles that are sure to come.

The question of reform, he says, can neither die nor be permanently at rest. It will not, however, be brought forward seriously for some few sessions, though private members may make reform-motions, rather to try the strength of parties than to lead to practical results. But the subject, he says, is one that must be dealt with, not in parts, but as a whole, and by the government of the day. He will therefore support no such private and partial motion; but he implies that when a government does bring it forward, he will not object to be a member of that government, and to give the measure his full support. Here, if we may judge from our experience of the late ministry, will be the true chance for the Tories. They will be prepared then to outbid the professed Liberals in a sweeping reform bill; but in the mean time they must put to sleep all irritating controversies which may excite political passions, always so contrary to Tory interests, which are built upon social passions. Especially they must avoid waking the sleeping cat of religious politics. This is the controversy chiefly to be dreaded. "In Scotland," says Lord Stanley, "the established religion is that of a minority of the people, and in Ireland it is that of a very inconsiderable minority. And I will tell you frankly that I look forward with uneasiness and apprehension to the discussion which some day or other will arise upon ecclesiastical affairs in those countries."

The strength of Toryism consists in the weakness of political passions; hence the Tory orator would lay those passions asleep, partly by persuading us that foreign politics do not concern us, partly by urging us to treat the domestic questions of the day as unpolitical, and therefore not affording a proper basis for political combinations and party warfare in parliament, and partly by putting off, to as distant a day as possible, the inevitable measures on reform and the Irish Church, the carriage of which the Tory party, by judicious management, may perhaps contrive to secure for itself. In the mean time, it may take its chance of a turn upon the Treasury benches, through the personal popularity of its leaders, or the unpopularity of its opponents.

Mr. Gladstone is the philosopher of a party whose strength is in activity, not in repose; and he therefore takes a very different view of the "conservative contentment" from that of Lord Stanley. In his speech at Manchester on the 24th of April, he gave his opinion of the reaction. According to him it is a "lethargy," a lamentable fit of laziness and carelessness, natural in a parliament which in the quarter of a century between 1830 and 1855 bestowed as much honest labour on political matters as had ever been given to them in the century and a half before. "Though we may regret," he



says, "we cannot wonder if, after such a period of activity, nations and parliaments, as well as men, feel tempted to repose." The parliamentary inaction, he thinks, is the counterpart and consequence of the listlessness of the people; when the nation raises its tone, the temper of parliament will at once respond. At present the country is afflicted with "a kind of sleeping of the blood, that hath its original in too much study and perturbation of the brain;" a kind of deafness, better described as a "disease of not listening, and malady of not marking." It is, however, both voluntary and curable. Hence the severity of Mr. Gladstone's remarks; and hence, in part, the anger of those whose interest it is to prolong the fit.

The difference between the conservative and the liberal view of the political calm is well worth noting. Lord Stanley considers the stagnation to be a conservative reaction, a healthy force, necessary as well for consolidating our gains, and perfecting their administrative working, as for putting a stop to an exaggerated and unreasonable progress. Mr. Gladstone considers it to be a coma of liberal politics, a disease that tends to make us lose sight of our principles, and commit ourselves to all manner of inconsistencies and dishonesties. To Mr. Gladstone it seems a passing inanition of the strong man; to Lord Stanley it seems a binding of the strong man by a stronger than he. Lord Stanley, indeed, betrays his distrust of his sleepy genius of Toryism when he deprecates all political excitement, and prays that the patient may not be prematurely awakened, and when he tries to pick all political significance out of those very questions about which Mr. Gladstone strives to evoke political passions. Mr. Gladstone, for instance, instead of thinking the French treaty a mere administrative measure, declares that its "political aspects are most important, and were from the first a material portion of the motives for prosecuting the enterprise to its end." The two statesmen agree about the fact that there is a reaction, resulting in a state of inaction. But one calls it conservative energy, the other liberal lethargy. Hence the difference in their practice. One sounds a trumpet in the ears of the nation to awaken it; the other bids it sleep on, because its exhausted strength needs recruiting, and slumber is food and medicine for it, because its foreign affairs, the only matters of present political interest, will settle themselves much better without than with irritating debates, while finance and church-rate questions are details of administration to be managed by the best managers, and because ecclesiastical disputes will weaken and exhaust the Tory energies, which ought all to be reserved for the coming Reform Bill.

The practice in the House of Commons has faithfully followed the preaching outside. The Tories avoided as long as they dared any discussion about policy, foreign or other, and confined themselves to criticising details of ministerial finance and administration. But the ministers on all occasions placed their active foreign policy in front of their programme, and manifested the same anxiety to prove that they were doing something as the opposition showed to prove that nothing ought to be done. And when at last, on the 8th of May, Sir Stafford Northcote attacked the whole scheme of ministerial finance, and Mr. Disraeli the whole scheme of ministerial policy, the chief displeasure of the Tory orators was exhibited against the statesman who had shown most desire to awake the nation. They cursed him as the climbing Gaul might have cursed the goose on the Capitol. What right had he to excite a "pressure from without" to enable him to do what he lacked force to do by legitimate parliamentary means, and to strengthen himself against both the House and his own colleagues? How dared he insult the House by implying it to be incapable of managing the national finance, and betray his colleagues by agreeing with them in the Cabinet, and throwing the blame of his measures exclusively upon them in public, thus undermining the collective responsibility of cabinets? Mr. Gladstone easily parried these thrusts; but he could not appease men whose interest it was to keep the nation asleep, who saw in him the noisiest of those who would awaken it, and who therefore considered his appeals to the people to be agitating in character and revolutionary in principle.

Mr. Disraeli's speech on the occasion was a party manifesto. It did touch upon foreign policy, but only to administer an opiate to those who were excited about it. "We are exhausted," he seemed to say, "and there is no present need of activity. Let us go to sleep; then we shall neither spend our money, nor enrage our allies and rivals by our meddling. We may safely repose. We are strong enough with our army, our militia, our volunteers, and our Channel fleet, to fear no attack. And we do not want to be aggressive. As to our costly 'moral influence,' this is the political incubus that oppresses us. It burdens the people with almost more taxes than they can pay, and saps the true strength of England, to maintain 'an irritating dictatorial policy which is dogmatical and overbearing.' Our real moral force is that foreigners should see that we have a 'virgin income-tax,'—money to spend, not money spent. Our present counterfeit moral power consists in irritating Napoleon III., by thwarting his federative policy in southern Italy, and in opposing, not his interests only, but our own also at Rome, by forbidding him to guaran-



tee the independence of the Pope. The Emperor earned his right to influence the settlement of Italy by his campaign of 1859; and he inherits, as ruler of Catholic France, the duty of securing the independence of the Holy See. It is only to enable us to interfere unjustly that we run a race with France in our naval and military expenditure, put together our 'bloated and swollen armaments,' and subject ourselves to 'exceptional' taxation, which recurs as regularly as if it were the rule, and must within five years drift us into war. Yet the present situation is not exceptional, for it makes no extraordinary demands upon us. We have no navy to reconstruct, no uncommon precautions to take. We may rest on our oars, and trust to the stream to carry us."

If this had been an honest exposition of policy, it would have irritated the country gentlemen by its subserviency to Napoleon III., and would have been but another instance of that worship of brute strength, which has heretofore made Mr. Disraeli the panegyrist of Nicholas and the friend of Austria. But they were not offended, because they believed it to be both impossible and insincere, and at the same time necessary in order to enable their leader to reconcile Conservative inertia with the sympathies of the legitimists, the indignation of the Catholics, and the economy of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright. A counterfeit deference to Napoleon III. seemed the only policy that could at once satisfy the country party, open new prospects to the hopes of those who desired to reseat Francis II. at Naples and to keep the Pope in Rome, and promise to reduce our army and navy to proportions that might almost content Mr. Bright. Perhaps Mr. Disraeli hoped that the manifest impossibility of his programme would prevent its driving from him those enemies of the French alliance who agree with Mr. Horsman, and those friends of aristocratic government who agree with Mr. Roebuck in his leaning towards Austria.

How illusory and deceitful the promises are may easily be shown in the case of the Catholics. While Mr. Disraeli offers them indistinct pledges of impossible changes in foreign policy, which they accept more because of their anger with Lord Palmerston than because of any belief in the giver of the pledges, he at the same time shows the greatest anxiety lest their domestic grievances should come under discussion, wishes to postpone the paltry endowment of their chaplains in prisons, and hushes up all controversy about the Irish Establishment. It is instructive to see how, in the debate on Irish education on the 22d of May, all reference to the Establishment was avoided by those who would have been first to denounce it if it had not been a prior object with them to dis-

place Lord Palmerston. Mr. P. Urquhart at last reproached both parties for avoiding "that blot," of which they were all as shy as men were of slavery in the old American Congress. The slight storm which followed this blow was hushed by a speaker pledged to turn out the Government, whom Mr. White-side complimented for his prudence. Yet, after all, the destruction of the Irish Establishment is of more solid importance, both to clergy and people, than a license granted by Mr. Disraeli to Napoleon III. to settle Italy as he likes. "Love for the laws and institutions of the country will never be possible in Ireland," say the Irish Bishops, "so long as Protestant ascendancy is maintained by a Church Establishment to which Irish Catholics are forced to contribute, and from which they receive in return nothing but insult and dishonour." But Irish politicians have always allowed themselves to be led off the scent of their true game by false trails. What with the delusions of repeal, tenant-right, and an English intervention in Italy in favour of the Pope, the Irish politicians have hitherto missed their true vocation. This is due partly to the Catholic oath; partly to a perverse and revolutionary notion of politics, which drives the Irish mind rather towards the chimeras of nationality and communism than towards the true political philosophy of which their countryman, Burke, was the great master; and partly to a half-conscious unwillingness to destroy the great grievance of all, till the smaller ones have been extinguished by means of agitations which will only be possible while the great provocation remains.

In the debate of the 4th of June, when Mr. Stansfeld's resolution showed how ready the Radical economists were to take Mr. Disraeli at his word, provided he would give sufficient pledges that he would fulfil his engagements, Mr. Forster, one of the school, proclaimed aloud that he preferred Mr. Disraeli's finance to Lord Palmerston's, and was only kept from supporting a Tory Ministry by fear of its foreign policy. Mr. Stansfeld was perfectly indifferent between the rival financiers, and attracted to Lord Palmerston only as a friend of the Italian revolution; while Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden showed that they had no care for any question of foreign policy except the French alliance, and were quite ready to avenge the defeat of Mr. Stansfeld on Lord Palmerston, by voting for Mr. Disraeli. Revolution and retrenchment are clearly the two trusses of hay between which Radicalism stands undecided. On the Tory side equal party disorganisation was evident. Mr. Walpole's amendment was directed against Mr. Gladstone only; its intention was to weaken the Chancellor of the Exchequer without turning out the Premier. When Mr. Walpole found that it would not have the effect which he in-



tended, he withdrew it, because he did not want to put Mr. Disraeli into power. Hence the bitterness of the disappointed placemen of whom Mr. Whiteside was the spokesman, the anger of Mr. Disraeli, ill-concealed in a speech flowing with gall and honey, and, on the other hand, the resentment of Sir W. Heathcote at Mr. Disraeli's sarcasms on Mr. Walpole. This, and the reception by the Opposition of Lord R. Montagu's declaration that they had no party intention, made it clear that a schism is by no means impossible in the Tory ranks, and that the country gentlemen are not yet prepared to second Mr. Disraeli in his alliance with the Radicals. Mr. Horsman's speech was directed against the finance of both Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone, and contained a panegyric of Lord Palmerston, of Mr. Gladstone, and especially of Lord Russell, for the foreign policy of the Government. The debate made it clear that the reaction has not yet progressed in Parliament far enough to make the reconstruction of the Tory party possible upon the plan of Mr. Disraeli.

III. The Conservative reaction in the country is the most difficult to describe, because while it is quite as heterogeneous and contradictory as the reaction in Parliament, it is at the same time much more complex, and it lacks any organ of expression, except the accidental echo which it finds in Parliament, or the press, or the general movement of society. It is complicated because it is partly intellectual (and so far it is faithfully represented in Parliament) and partly social. Both intellectually and socially it results in important political changes. For instance, few people have yet calculated the effect of the Volunteer movement in promoting Conservative feeling and patriotism, and in discouraging Chartism and those combinations which have for their object the triumph of the principles of 1789. Beneath the warlike feeling against Russia in 1854, there was much sympathy with revolution, with Kossuth, and the Poles. Beneath that against America in 1862, there was no sympathy with revolution, but a great revulsion against democracy. The whole military and naval excitement in England, at least since the annexation of Savoy, has been directed against despotisms and democracies; and in its positive bearings it has had no tendency whatever towards setting up a military dictation in England, but has remained strictly within the limits of the constitution. This is a Conservative reaction in the best sense of the word.

If we look now to religion, the highest expression of social life, we shall obtain a different result. Whatever gains the Establishment may have made are all external; its internal changes have all been downwards. We see a progressive relaxation of doctrine and discipline, resulting in the approxi-

mation of churchmen to nonconformists in doctrine, and of nonconformists to churchmen in discipline ; a gradual obliteration of Christian tradition, as shown in the passive acquiescence in the rubrical decisions of the Privy Council and the practical acceptance of the law of divorce ; the social degradation of the clerical office by the fanaticism of the Evangelicals and the scepticism of the Broad Churchmen, which have combined to drive the aristocracy of talent and education to seek employment elsewhere ; the decreasing power of the pulpit, and the increasing influence of the impersonal and anonymous moralists of the press. All these things contribute to the social demoralisation of the Establishment. Politically, they destroy its Conservative character, by alienating it from the aristocracy and throwing it into the arms of the democracy, while at the same time they make it an instrument for converting the nonconformists into Tories, or bigoted Church-and-State men, by giving them a new interest in the old institution. Here, then, we see in the deep waters of society the same tendency towards an alliance of Toryism and Radicalism as we see on the surface of Parliamentary parties.

There is no great wonder in this ; for Liberalism, Conservatism, and Toryism, have each a definite and fixed relation to religious thought and feeling. Toryism may be called religiousness without a religion, while liberalism is a religion without religiousness. The strength of the Tory is in passions, especially social and religious passions ; that of the Liberal is in theories aiming (sometimes very wide of the mark) at the utility and happiness of mankind. Whenever, in the ebb and flow of time, theories become suspected and logic distrusted, there naturally arises a keener consciousness of the weakness of human guidance on one hand, and of the strength and harmony of nature on the other. Men will trust to events, or to fate, where they will not trust the pilot. For the notion of fate, the religious mind will substitute the idea of providence ; but the facility of the change and the naturalness of the substitution prove how near akin are the two ideas, and how easily a fatalistic carelessness may counterfeit a religious confidence. Hence the favour with which religious men may regard a political adventurer who trusts to luck, who has no plans, who depends on happy accidents and the throw of the dice, and who follows events without attempting to lead them. This is a temper of mind with which untheoretical men, active or inactive, are very prone to sympathise. They follow the rule of thumb, or they are too lazy to learn, or they hate to have their old opinions and habits disturbed. Affection takes the place of reason, and traditions become sacred in their eyes.



They equally oppose scientific and political innovations; the basis of their character is reverence for what has been hitherto revered, honour for what has been honoured, and fidelity to the tradition they have received. In politics this is Toryism, in religion it is the ordinary type of the believer. It is common to Christianity and all other faiths. "There is no wisdom," wrote the Cadi to Mr. Layard, "equal to the belief in God; He created the world. Shall we liken ourselves unto Him in seeking to penetrate into the mysteries of His creation? shall we say, 'Behold how that star spinneth round that other star'? *Let it go. He from whose hand it came will govern and direct it.*"

This is the religiousness which finds its political expression in Toryism. But religion has two phases: one which it exhibits when it goes forth conquering and to conquer; another which it displays while it is engaged in preserving its conquests. A religion conquers mainly by the weapons of intellect, and subsists mainly by the aid of feeling. While it is aggressive it is liberal, because it is intellectual. Then it is controversial, keen, subtle, disputative, an enemy of all old prejudices that might stay its progress; and of all hindrances to freedom of discussion, liberty of conscience, or publicity of profession, which stand in its way. When it ceases to be aggressive it becomes conservative. When it has once conquered unbelief it afterwards affects the character more than the intellect, for the simple reason that men have a common tendency not to think about that which they no longer doubt, but to sink into "the deep slumber of a decided opinion." They become first dogmatists without a theology, and then they forget the meaning and the application of the dogmas which they profess. They permit no controversy about dogma, out of reverence for its sacred character; and thus their tactics become similar to those of their sceptical and infidel opponents, who also discourage such controversy, not out of reverence for dogma, but because they hold it to be irrational and unfit to be argued about. Thus *concordats* become possible between infidels and stagnant believers, on the ground of their common desire to suppress religious controversy—on one side, to prevent religion being altered; on the other, to prevent its becoming aggressive. On the other hand, alliances may be made between aggressive believers and infidel revolutionists or Radicals, on the ground of a common desire to destroy an obstructive Establishment, or to obtain freedom of speech and profession, both in religion and in politics. Again, since a religion is commonly conservative at its geographical centre, and aggressive at its extremities, it may easily sympathise

with Tories in one place and with Liberals in another; or, when its dangers at the centre, or its successes at the extremities, are great enough to rule the feelings of the whole mass, the politics of the whole body may take their colour from the prevailing enthusiasm. In the victorious era of Gregory VII., Rome was the school of constitutional liberties. In the present condition of Rome, the Irish Catholics forget their natural politics, and turn to the Tories as their most congenial allies.

These principles seem to account for the double change in the Establishment—its social and internal degradation by democratic admixture, and its external strengthening through the political weight of its new allies. While the Nonconformists were in uncompromising hostility to it, they were Radicals and destructives with regard to the “Constitution in Church and State;” now that a narrower gulf divides them from it, their hostility is being appeased. The policy of getting is being modified by the policy of keeping, or rather by the policy of allowing the matter in dispute to remain sufficiently valuable to be worth getting and keeping. The invader no longer pillages but protects, with an eye to the future. So among the Catholics of the Empire. For domestic policy their natural alliance is with those who wish to destroy the Irish Establishment; but these are not only the philosophic liberals, but Radicals, infidels of all kinds, and revolutionists. For their foreign policy, which at the present crisis is of overwhelming importance to them, they agree best with Tories and legitimists; but failing these, they hope for better terms from the influence upon Italy of despotic France alone, than from that of England with or without France. Hence their interest leads them to the same amalgamation of Radical and Tory politics, though for perfectly different objects, as we find in the Establishment and in the parties in Parliament. These are only two instances of a complex web of shifting alliances and changing interests, the whole combination of which furnishes the religious contribution to the Conservative reaction.

The military and religious movements of the country are only specimens of the social changes going on in every part of society. The extension of education among the lower orders, the increase of luxury and expense in the middle classes, the supremacy of trading interests in our political combinations, and the retirement of the old aristocracy from the antagonisms of political life—each of these processes is causing an alteration in the elements in which the forces of our constitution reside, though not necessarily in the equilibrium of the forces



themselves. We may even now be witnessing the gradual substitution of a new for an old aristocracy, and the raising of a new middle class from the upper portion of the lower orders. Such a movement would still preserve the differentiation of our classes, and our aristocratic constitution, though it merged our present aristocracy into a wider class, and gave it a new character and new habits. Such a process as this would present the varied and contradictory phenomena of a Conservative reaction and democratic progress combined; for each mass of men that was raised to a higher class would more or less assume the character of that class, and perpetuate the old feelings and traditions in a new family and new blood, at the same time that it tended to destroy and throw down the old classes which it supplanted. But the old balance would still be preserved, though the actual weights in each scale were changed.

With regard to the intellectual reaction in the country, it is only necessary to refer to the phenomena that I have already noticed,—the influence of the example of foreign politics upon our own. To learn such lessons needs a certain amount of intelligence directed to that particular end. We have happily learned from others' experience, not from our own, to distrust those French and American ideas of democratic equality which were lately so rife, to recant our acquiescence in the political ascendancy of the ideal working-man, which was lately the cant of the hustings, and to disown the theory of the inevitable deluge of democracy so industriously taught us by Mr. J. S. Mill. We now believe that the people can be transfigured and differentiated as it gradually rises, and we do not think it vain to study the best way of bringing about this result. Thus the old English constitutional ideas are regaining their power, while revolutionary ideas are losing their attractiveness. Politics are better understood. Political philosophers not only sit in the House of Commons, but are listened to there, and their speeches are eagerly read. It may soon become possible to restore the reign of principle and doctrine, and to steer the ship by general rules, and the scientific appliances of compass, chart, and quadrant, instead of merely coasting from one beacon to the next that happens to be in sight, as our statesmen do when their only policy is involved in the question how to pass a given measure.

R. S.

---

## RECENT IRISH LEGISLATION.

It is nearly seven hundred years since England and Ireland were first connected by the link of the crown, and ruled over by the same sovereign. During all that period, Ireland has been to England a perpetual difficulty; during much the greatest part of it, she has been to the country with which she was brought into a compulsory and unwilling connection far more a source of weakness than an accession of strength. And even at the present day it cannot be said that the Irish difficulty has altogether disappeared. Things, it is true, have changed very much in Ireland. In spite of the recent agrarian outrages, it cannot be denied that there is now a greater respect for the law amongst the people than there ever was before. Great as is the existing distress, it is now confined to particular districts of the country, and no longer general and spreading, as formerly, over the entire face of the land. Yet, notwithstanding this, it is equally impossible for us to close our eyes to the fact that there is still great and serious discontent among the Irish people. That discontent in some quarters confines itself to attempts to obtain certain modifications in existing laws. Some political leaders make the Established Church the principal object of their attacks; others, while not silent upon this grievance, look upon the laws relating to the tenure of land, and upon the relations between landlord and tenant, as forming the most essential subject-matter of reform. Another party, again, seeks to strike deeper still, and raising the cry of a separate nationality, professedly aims at nothing short of the dismemberment of the empire, and the separation, total and eternal, of Ireland from Great Britain. All these different parties, and the various questions which they agitate, do still, beyond a doubt, constitute a very great difficulty in the way of any government which seeks to deal with Irish affairs; and the spirit of discontent which is thus kept alive in the country still, to a great degree, continues to prevent Ireland from being that important element of strength which she ought to be to the British state.

The explanation of a great deal of this difficulty is to be found in the past history of the country, and in the traces which wrongs, redressed but not yet forgotten, have left upon the minds of the people. In its origin, the relation between England and Ireland was that of a conquering to a conquered



country. That circumstance alone, even if the rule of the conquerors had been the most beneficent that could be imagined, would be a key to a vast portion of the mass of Irish discontent. Benefits that are conferred by force are seldom received with gratitude. In the case of any nation, wretched as its independence may have been, miserable as the social system may have been which prevailed within it, the loss of freedom will generally, so long as human nature is the same, outweigh any improvements with which subjection may be accompanied. And assuredly small respect can be entertained for any people which would contentedly barter its freedom for material advantages. But in the case of Ireland the bitterness of conquest was unrelieved by any, even the smallest, evidence of good will on the part of the conquerors. No attempt was made to improve the people; there was no thought of introducing amongst them any better laws than those to which they had been accustomed. They were reviled as savages, but no effort was made to reclaim them. The Irish people knew the English in one character, and in one only, that of un-pitying relentless enemies and oppressors. So things continued for four centuries, when a new source of misery and hatred arose, and to the quarrel of nationality against nationality was added that of religion against religion. England went, or was driven, into Protestantism; Ireland remained faithful to her old creed. A long struggle ensued, in which even more than the old ferocity was displayed upon both sides, until it ended by the triumph of the stronger. Then commenced in Ireland a period of national degradation such as no other country has ever yet known. England had conquered; and, partly as the means, partly as the result of her conquest, she had planted in Ireland a strong English Protestant colony. To that colony, filled as it was with both hatred and contempt for the natives of the country which was meted out to it, was given the task of governing the land. We all know how that task was performed by our countrymen. The colony had but one simple theory of government—hatred of Popery; and that theory it carried into practice with the most unyielding firmness. The clergy of the Church to which the vast majority of the people belonged were proscribed and hunted down. The laity could obtain the consolations of their religion by stealth only, in mean and hidden places. The Catholic gentry, who yet retained some little portions of their former extensive domains after the confiscations of James, of Oliver, and of William, held their estates almost on sufferance. Every honourable career was closed against them; they could neither serve their sovereign in the field, nor their country in

Parliament. The middle classes could not look to a profession for their livelihood ; every thing was closed against them also. Not even the lowest public employment was open to a Papist. And when the Catholic gentleman or tradesman ceased to think merely of his own position, and turned his eyes upon the children who were growing up about him, they suggested to him new reasons for detesting the government under which he lived. One class of laws forbid him either to educate them at home in the faith of their ancestors, or to send them to obtain that education abroad. Another was expressly framed to encourage them to an unnatural plunder of their parents. Thus the seeds of a feeling worse than discontent were implanted in the minds both of the gentry and the middle classes. The peasantry, neglected and uneducated, crushed down in the direst physical misery, treated as brutes by a proprietary with whom they had no single thing—in many districts not even language—in common, seeing their religion, the only institution which they had reason to love, persecuted and insulted, were not likely to cherish any warm feelings of affection for the system under which they lived, or the country in whose name that system was carried out.

Such was the state of things in Ireland until nearly the close of the last century, when some of these evils began, slowly, grudgingly, and ungraciously, to be remedied. Since then great alterations have taken place : the reforms begun in 1773 have been steadily continued, and very nearly all the injustice of old times has been swept away. But the effects of a long course of misgovernment are not to be got rid of in a single generation. Nations have memories as well as men ; and it is not to be supposed that they can at once forget the evils they have suffered, even though those evils may in great part have disappeared. There is no Irishman, even among those who are most willing to make the best of the present state of things, and who are anxious to be faithful and attached subjects of the sovereign who now reigns over us, who can escape a feeling of indignation and anger when he looks back, as he often is obliged to do, upon the past history of his country. There are very few, and those few are perhaps little to be envied their tranquillity of temper, who, when they think of the last century in Ireland, can say to themselves, that had they lived in those days they would have been other than most determined enemies of the then government of the country. Can it be wondered at if this feeling is with many something more than historical ? Can any one be surprised if many of the hot-headed and half-educated classes throughout the country forget the present for the past, continue to brood over bygone wrongs,



and clutch eagerly at those which still remain, as reasons for nursing an unforgiving discontent? We are not saying that these feelings are right, or that they are such as sensible practical men would cherish, but they are perfectly intelligible; their existence is the Nemesis which naturally follows upon the evil doings of past days; and time only, together with a course of judicious legislation, can entirely obliterate them from the minds of the Irish people.

The history of the country, therefore, and the feelings which naturally arise from the consideration of it, form one explanation of the fact that there is still an Irish difficulty. But that history is emphatically past. The worst of the old grievances have disappeared for ever. Yet, notwithstanding this, there is still a strong feeling that much remains to be done before Irish Catholics can justly be satisfied with their position, and that feeling affords a second explanation of the discontent which prevails. What, then, is it that so remains to be done? What are the demands which ought to be pressed by the people, and ought to be yielded to by the government? What are the still existing grievances the redress of which Irish Catholics ought to include in their petition of right, and without the redress of which there never can be that cordial feeling of union and friendship between England and Ireland which is so needful to both? In order to arrive at a satisfactory answer to these questions, it will be necessary, before every thing else, to consider the present condition of Ireland, legally speaking. Before we can come to any conclusion as to what ought to be done, we must have a clear view of what has been done, especially since the great revolution which was effected in 1829.

That period forms a good starting-point for those who wish to consider the modern history of Ireland. It was a period of a great change,—when old ideas were abandoned and new ones adopted. The Emancipation Act, although it left much undone, nevertheless did much also. There never was a statute which more completely deserved the name by which it is popularly known, and by which we have just described it; it was truly an emancipating law. If it did not at once confer upon the Catholics a practical equality with their Protestant fellow-subjects, it did certainly give them the means by which they might in time achieve that equality; if it did not remove all grievances, it did at least give to Catholics a better opportunity than they had ever before enjoyed of making their voices heard, and of contending, with greater prospect of success than previously, for the redress of their wrongs. It did more, too. It gave to Catholics a share in the govern-

ment of the empire, allowed them to give their opinions and their votes upon great public questions of domestic and foreign policy, and thus raised the position of the entire body. With respect to Ireland particularly, its effects were undeniably great. Till then Irish Catholics, that is, in fact, the Irish nation, were simply slaves; and it could not with the slightest show of justice be contended that Ireland, in relation to the sister island, was any thing but a subject country. That ceased to be the case from the moment when Irish constituencies were free to send to the national council representatives who felt with them upon all the most vital questions upon which men can agree or differ with each other, and who were as free to make their voices heard upon every question as the most bigoted Protestant, who for twenty years had been giving a zealous and consistent negative to every plan for Catholic relief. Men are no longer slaves who are admitted on equal terms to the councils of their former masters. They may have grievances that remain unremedied, but the character of slavery at least has disappeared. Apart, too, from the position of Ireland in the empire, an enormous change was effected in Ireland herself. It was no slight revolution which flung open to Catholics nearly all the roads to public employment, broke down the old ascendancy which had lasted for so many years, allowed Catholics to have a share in the management of their own municipal concerns, and, above all, permitted them to hope that that most important of all matters in the government of every commonwealth, the administration of justice, would no longer be exclusively confined to one dominant faction. We insist upon these topics, because we think that among a certain class of politicians there is a disposition to undervalue the effects of the Catholic Relief Act of 1829. We have seen that measure described, by an author of no little fame in Ireland, as one that "puts a silken badge on a few members of one profession." It did much more; and no rightly-thinking man can refuse to admit its vast importance. It was perhaps the most statesmanlike measure that the imperial Parliament ever passed,—one that alone would be sufficient to give the stamp of greatness to the ministers who were wise enough to see its expediency; and it formed a triumph which the Irish people, whose energy and perseverance forced it upon their rulers, can never be too proud of.

But what have been the results of the measure, as evidenced by legislation? Has the spirit of that legislation been influenced at all by the presence of Catholic members of Parliament? We propose, in the course of the next few pages, to review shortly the most important enactments relating to



Ireland which have been passed since the Emancipation Act became law.

With a large portion of that legislation we do not intend to trouble our readers. A great deal of all legislation is, so to speak, purely professional. It has technicalities only for its object; and notwithstanding the importance of much of this branch, notwithstanding that, in omitting all consideration of it, we are necessarily altogether passing over some very important topics,—such, for instance, as that of law reform,—it is better that we should do so. Our concern, when we speak of legislation, is with those laws which bear immediately upon the social and political condition of the people; and although measures such as those of law reform may undoubtedly in time, and in their effects, bear very strongly upon that condition, yet the working is too remote for our consideration at present. Taking, then, those laws which, as we have just said, are immediately and in their essence of a social and political bearing, we shall divide them into two great heads. The first is of those laws which are of a penal and repressive character, which do not pretend to effect any reform, but merely to supply punishments, to regulate society by fear, and to put down, as with a strong hand, certain alleged disorders. The second division comprises those laws which, like the Emancipation Act, profess either to remove injustice or to effect reform,—those, in a word, which have improvement of some kind, as distinguished from mere punishment, for their object. We shall speak of each division in its turn.

Whether from the peculiar nature of the crimes which those who legislated for Ireland had to deal with, or from some peculiar harshness in the minds of the legislators themselves, there have for a long time existed in Ireland particular codes of criminal law which have not existed in England. We do not now speak of the Penal Laws usually so called. They were of a purely political character, enacted for a political purpose; and England had a code of that nature quite as stringent as the Irish code. Neither do we speak at present of the Irish Convention Act, a statute passed by an independent Irish Parliament, for the express purpose of preventing expressions of Irish national feeling; and in consequence of which the appointment and assembling of delegates, which is quite lawful in England, is in Ireland a grievous breach of the law of the land. But, besides these enactments, there have been from time to time statutes passed relating to Ireland which in their effect have given to the executive, in many instances, the power of abrogating at its pleasure all the constitutional laws of the country. Nothing like them exists on

this side of St. George's Channel. In the middle of the last century certain agrarian disturbances broke out in the south of Ireland. Again, towards the close of the century, they appeared afresh. On neither occasion was there any thing of a political nature, properly speaking, in these disturbances. They were the natural consequences of fearful physical misery, of high rents, of grasping landlords, and of tithe-farmers. In the debates upon the subject in the Irish House of Commons, it was alleged that the people who took part in the outrages which were perpetrated were not disaffected towards the Government, and that local tyranny, not national wrong, was the object of their attacks. But be that as it may, the Irish Parliament resolved to treat the rioters with the utmost severity, and Acts of Parliament were passed which assuredly did not err upon the side of tenderness for the criminals. Again, after the Union, and after Emancipation, the state of many districts in Ireland became most alarming. In many places it amounted to nothing short of insurrection. The people refused to pay tithes, and even refused to allow them to be paid. The collection of this obnoxious impost was a service which could be performed only at the point of the bayonet. Murders were matters of everyday occurrence. Day after day, night after night, the sound of the horn was heard calling the peasantry together for lawless purposes; and bonfires were seen blazing on the hills,—the sure signs of some gathering that boded no good to landlords or tithe-owners. Such was the state of the country when, in the year 1833, the then Whig ministry brought in and passed into law a Bill which is a curiosity as emanating from a constitutional assembly, and which is a still greater curiosity when we bear in mind that that constitutional assembly was the first reformed parliament,—a body which it might be supposed was full of jealousy for the rights of the subject, and determined against allowing those rights to be in the smallest degree infringed upon. The law we speak of was, “An Act for the more effectual suppression of local disturbances and dangerous associations in Ireland” (3 & 4 William IV. c. 4), and it armed the Irish executive with powers which the most irresponsible despot that ever reigned in the most slavish climates might envy. One class of its sections did away with the constitutional right of meeting and petitioning Parliament. The Lord-Lieutenant was empowered by order to prohibit or suppress any meeting which he might deem dangerous to the public safety; and two justices of the peace might forcibly enter any place where a prohibited meeting was being held, and order the assembly to disperse. In



districts proclaimed, under the powers given by the Act to the Lord-Lieutenant, no meeting could be held for the purpose of petitioning Parliament, without the Lord-Lieutenant's consent first obtained, except in the case of meetings convened by the high-sheriff of a county; and even at these no person who was not resident in the county, and a registered twenty-pound freeholder, could take any part. Another class of sections established an inquisition of the most odious character in the proclaimed districts. The tenants of houses in those districts were to deliver to the chief constable correct lists of all males living in the houses, distinguishing in the lists those who were of the age of fourteen years from those who were under that age. One copy of the list so made out was to be delivered to the constable; another to be kept by the householder, and posted up in his dwelling. Any justice of the peace might, after sunset, go to any dwelling, and require the male inhabitants to show themselves. Those who were absent without some good excuse from this species of evening review were by that very fact guilty of a misdemeanour. Individuals found out of their dwellings, under suspicious circumstances, after sunset might be committed and convicted of a misdemeanour. It was a misdemeanour to make fire on the mountains, to blow a horn, or to use any other signal. It was a misdemeanour to be in possession of arms. And, to complete this despotic code, new tribunals were established for the purpose of carrying it out. The people were not even to have these Draconian laws administered by those usual judges whose habits and profession might have the effect of disposing them to a caution and lenity which were far from the minds of the legislators. The inhabitants of the proclaimed districts were handed over to the tender mercies of courts-martial, of whose severity the people of Ireland had often before had the most terrible examples. Of course, due provision was made for doing away with any benefit that might arise from the operation of the Habeas Corpus Act, and for preventing recourse to the ordinary tribunals for redress against the oppressions which might arise in the course of the execution of the statute. The passing of the Act was vigorously opposed by the Irish liberals, as well as by some English members; and the long debates on it contain some of the most striking examples of modern parliamentary eloquence. O'Connell and Sheil on one side, and Mr. Stanley on the other, spoke with all the eloquence and vigour for which they were respectively distinguished, as they did also in the debates on another bill, which was brought in and carried about the same time, and which enabled the Government in certain cases to have trials held, not according to the

spirit of English law, in the county where the offence had been committed, but in some adjoining one to be selected by the Crown. Both these Acts have long since expired. The statute for suppressing local disturbances and dangerous associations was never, it is right to say, carried into execution, at least in its worst features. It was passed but for one year, and was afterwards continued for a limited period, except as to the portions of it which related to the suppression of meetings and to the holding of courts-martial. But though unexecuted, and though now a thing of the past, it still remains upon the statute-book, to tell students of Irish history of the small regard to constitutional principles which has, even in most recent times, animated our rulers when Ireland was in question. It undoubtedly converted the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland into an irresponsible despot, and clothed him with an authority which would never, under any circumstances of crime or outrage, be tolerated in England. Yet, bad, unconstitutional, and cruel as this statute was, Irishmen ought not to forget when they arraign the Acts of the imperial Parliament, that it was mild and merciful when compared with the laws by which their independent Irish Parliament dealt with outrages similar to those which the statute of 1833 sought to suppress. If our readers wish for an example of Irish legislation for Irish crime, they have only to turn to the volume of the Irish statutes for the year 1787. There, in the "White Boys Act," they will find a code compared with which the statute we have just described is a code of mercy and humanity. After all, the imperial statute does not call in the hangman to aid in carrying it out. There is in the Irish statute scarcely a section which does not make the crime for which it provides felony without benefit of clergy. Where the imperial legislature would treat an offence as a misdemeanour, and provide imprisonment with or without hard labour as its punishment, the Irish statute ordains death. In one instance it even seeks to work upon popular feeling by continuing its severity still further, and expressly adds to the penalty of death the degrading sentence that the culprit shall be dissected.

The Act of 1833 has long since expired, but a modification of it is even now in force. In the year 1847, an Act was passed for a limited time, having for its object the better prevention of crime and outrage in certain parts of Ireland. The period at which this Act was passed was a melancholy one. A misery which, even in the annals of Irish wretchedness, was unsurpassed reigned through the country. The potato, which formed the ordinary food of the people, had



completely failed. Thousands upon thousands of wretched beings were in a state of starvation. The people were dying by the road-sides; those who still lived, lived so that death would have been welcome to them. People in England, people even in the more prosperous parts of Ireland, in the north and east, can form no idea of the sufferings of the wretched inhabitants of Munster and Connaught at that unhappy period. Side by side with this misery arose in many parts of the country, what almost invariably in Ireland accompanies a period of distress, a struggle for the land. The landlords who were not receiving their rents sought to enforce their legal rights. The tenants in some districts were determined not to surrender their holdings, the possession of which could alone give them even a shadow of hope that they might pass in safety through the terrible crisis which was going on. Thence arose one of those agrarian wars which are so frequent in Irish history. The peasant became an assassin. He either went out and committed murder himself, or he hired some wretch who for a paltry reward was willing to take the guilt of blood upon his soul, and run his chance of escaping the punishment of the law. It cannot be denied, that in the districts of which we speak the peasantry, as a class, invariably sided—as we have lately seen them do—with the assassins, or, if they did not afford them active succour, did not at least give any aid in bringing them to justice. In this state of things the statute we are speaking of was passed. It enabled the Lord-Lieutenant to proclaim any district in the country, and, after the proclamation, to increase the constabulary force in that district, the increased expense thus occasioned falling in the last instance upon the proclaimed district. The possession of arms was made a misdemeanour. Those who were suspected of carrying them might be searched, and houses might be entered by force between sunset and sunrise, if it was thought that arms were concealed within them. Offences against the Act were made punishable by two years' imprisonment with or without hard labour. Although this statute was passed for a limited period only, it has been from time to time continued with certain modifications, and is even now in all its essentials a part of the law of Ireland.

“The Peace Preservation Continuance Act” has been now for several years passed at certain intervals as regularly as the Mutiny Act, and with almost as little opposition. How far the system of exceptional legislation, of which it forms a portion, is useful, is a matter upon which there may be justly a considerable difference of opinion. As a rule, exceptional

legislation is decidedly to be deprecated. Where two countries have been united, as England and Ireland have been, where each forms an integral portion of the same empire, and, theoretically at least, each enjoys the same constitutional rights as the other, one set of imperial laws ought to apply to both. It is perhaps mainly owing to the observance of this principle that France has attained the wonderful unity which she displays. There is scarcely a less difference between the characters of the people of Brittany and of Alsace, of Flanders and of Languedoc, than between those of the people of England and of Ireland. The history even of some portions of France is not such as would lead us to suppose that they could easily be brought to coalesce with those other portions in conjunction with which they form a great, a flourishing, and a united empire. Many of the provinces of modern France were for ages in open hostility with the crown to which they now pay a willing allegiance. Provence was long independent; so too was Burgundy. Brittany for a long time resented the union which brought it under the immediate authority of the throne. Alsace was as completely conquered as Ireland, and was violently severed from that German connection which race, language, habits, and religion appeared to make much more natural to it than any connection with Latin and Catholic France. At the present day, however, all these different provinces form one country as unmistakeably as Middlesex and Yorkshire do. But for a long time they have been subject to identically the same laws. There is not one code for Strasburg and another for Paris. A French citizen does not at one end of the empire find himself in a country which is governed upon strictly constitutional principles, and at the other in one where the command of a viceroy may at any moment suspend the application of those principles, and substitute a despotism in their place. There is not one law for education, for the relief of the poor, for many matters relating to the title to property, in one part of France, and a different one in another. Whatever shortcomings there may be in the French administration affect equally the entire country; the benefits of the system are also equally shared. Such is not the case with us; and quite apart from the question of wrongs and grievances, the want of unity of law must to a great extent prevent unity of feeling between the different members of our empire. The excuse which is usually given for this exceptional legislation is the great difference between the state of things in England and in Ireland. So long, it is said, as agrarian outrage exists in Ireland, so long as in whole dis-



tricts the great mass of the people are banded together in a conspiracy against the law, so long there must be two systems of legislation for the two countries. It cannot be denied that there is some truth in this, and that the state of things in Ireland has but too often afforded a justification for harsh measures; though, even in that view, the same state of things called perhaps for exceptional remedial laws which have never been enacted. But it must not be forgotten that there has been violent political agitation in England, and that sometimes a system of outrage has existed there quite as bad as that which has been seen in Ireland. There are counties in England in which the labouring population have occasionally resorted to measures of extreme violence. In the manufacturing districts, strikes have been not unfrequently accompanied with attempts upon the security both of life and of property. In the year 1843, a great part of Wales was virtually in a state of insurrection, resulting from the grievance of excessive tolls. In that very year there was passed for Ireland an Arms Act, which made it penal for any person to possess arms without a license, and required those persons who should be permitted to possess arms to have them marked with a particular brand. No such enactment was considered necessary for Wales; nor, notwithstanding the violence of the outrages there, and the extent to which the population was implicated in them, was it thought expedient to pass any White-boy Code or any Peace Preservation Act for that country. The ordinary tribunals, the ordinary constitutional powers, were considered and proved sufficient for the support of authority. In the same way, when, in 1848, the last faint effect of the French Revolution of that year reached England and Ireland alike, and in the one country the supporters of the Charter, in the other the Young Ireland party, exhibited a spirit which threatened to disturb the public peace, the Irish agitators were honoured with an amount of legislative notice which was not bestowed upon their English brethren. An Act was passed on the 25th July 1848 to empower the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to apprehend and detain, until the 1st of March 1849, such persons as he should suspect of conspiring against her Majesty's person and government. It recites that "a treasonable and rebellious spirit of insurrection now exists in Ireland," and then, "for the better preservation of her Majesty's most sacred person, and for securing the peace, the laws, and liberties of this kingdom," it enacts that all persons imprisoned in Ireland at the date of the Act, or afterwards by Privy Council warrant, for high treason or treasonable practices, or suspicion of high treason

or treasonable practices, or by warrant of the Lord-Lieutenant for the like causes, may be detained without bail until the 1st of March 1849, and shall not be bailed, or even tried, until that date without the order of the Privy Council. It also gives the Lord-Lieutenant power to change the place of detention of any persons who may be confined. Now it is impossible to deny that there was good reason for the passing of this Act, as well as of that which continued it for a short time; but it may be doubted whether, considering the circumstances of England at the same period, and considering also the constitutional theory, that England and Ireland form but one country, it was wise to make so marked a distinction, even for a limited time, between the political positions of the two countries. Surely, if dangerous disturbances had existed in any one shire of England, it never would have been proposed to make a particular law for that one county, especially if those disturbances, or others of a similar nature, existed in other counties. However, for the present at least, there seems to be little prospect that this system of enacting separate and distinct repressive laws for Ireland, and thus putting that country upon a different constitutional footing from this island, will be discontinued. It has been put into practice by all parties as they have come into power. Neither Whig nor Tory has abstained from it; and, to say the truth, no party in Ireland seems very strongly to object to it, considered as a system, although each of the great Irish parties does object to it according to its application. Thus the Liberal body has always opposed such coercion laws as the Act of 1833 and the Act of 1847. On the other hand, the Orange party, while highly approving the statutes which in their practical operation chiefly affect the Catholic peasantry, finds no terms too strong to use in reprobation of those Acts by which an attempt has been made to restrain its own excesses.

If Catholics could for a moment be doubtful of the effect, as to their own position, of their admission into Parliament, they would find strong evidence of its importance in the fact that it is only since the Act of 1829 that the legislature has made any special attempt to deal with the insolence and ferocity of the Orange party. Previously to that statute we shall look in vain for any law upon this subject. The close of the last century, the last epoch of the independence of the Irish Parliament, was a period of triumph for the ascendancy faction. After the Union, and during the long Tory rule which lasted through the Regency and the reign of George IV., the same faction held Ireland at its feet, and governed the Irish



people as it chose. But this sovereignty ended with the passing of the Emancipation Act. Thenceforward there was a Catholic influence in the House of Commons, and as the result of that influence almost every vestige of the old ascendancy has gradually disappeared, and the faction has been slowly learning that Irish Catholics are under the protection of the laws, and do not exist merely for the purpose of being insulted and massacred upon particular anniversaries. There have been three statutes passed since the year 1829 for the purpose of restraining party processions in Ireland. The date of the first is 1832, that of the second 1850, and that of the last 1860. Each was occasioned by some unfortunate display which resulted in the deaths of some individuals and in the maiming of many. They all commence with a recital of the reasons which caused the necessity of their enactment, and then proceed to provide a punishment for marching processions with party emblems, playing party tunes, and carrying arms. Each of these offences is made a misdemeanour. The last Act is the most stringent of all, and is not merely directed against marching in procession and assembling in numbers for the purpose of celebrating party anniversaries, as the previous Acts were. The display or exhibition of a banner, flag, or party emblem or signal, the suffering or permitting even of such a display or exhibition, are made misdemeanours; and the words of the Act are so wide that it is difficult to say what acts may not come within them. It is humiliating to Irishmen to open the volume which contains this enactment, to find that the statute immediately preceding (which was brought into Parliament by a private member) is one designed to encourage that grand volunteer movement which of late years has been so active in England, and then to consider that, while from that preceding statute Ireland is expressly excepted, the next notice of her is a legislative monument of those wretched party divisions which have formed one of the main reasons why Irishmen on their own soil are not permitted to arm for the defence of the empire to which their country belongs. To see an end put to those divisions is what every friend to Ireland must ardently desire, whatever may be his views as to the particular measures which ought to be adopted with reference to her government. Till they die away, we can scarcely expect that that exceptional legislation of which we have been speaking will cease. We can only hope that as time goes on all classes of the Irish people will more and more learn a respect for law. Already, when we compare the present with the past, we cannot, in spite of the late outrages, fail to recognise that the lesson is begin-

ning to be learned. As the peace of the country increases, we trust that the Government will acknowledge the advantages which must arise from having but one code for England and Ireland alike, and that the statute-book will cease to be disfigured by those laws which practically declare that Ireland is to be governed on different and harsher principles than our own country.

We now pass to the second branch of our subject,—to those civil, as distinguished from criminal and penal, laws which have been passed for Ireland during the last thirty years. Some consideration of these is very important, as showing the progress that has been made since the Emancipation Act, and the extent to which the spirit of that measure has been carried out. It will also show what attention has been given to the social condition of Ireland, and what measures have been adopted to remedy a bad state of things, besides those repressive enactments which we have just been considering. One great difference between the statutes upon which we are now entering and those which we have just left must strike us at the outset. The latter are all temporary, passed for a particular moment to meet a temporary state of things, and continued from time to time as occasion required. They are rather perhaps executive acts of the legislature than laws. The statutes we are now about to describe are permanent in their nature, and intended to last for ever, as the laws of the land. We shall not attempt to allude to them all; but, taking the great subjects of legislation in order, we shall proceed to show what legislative action has been taken upon each of them.

To begin with those laws which immediately affect the political position of the Irish people. The very first statute which we find after the Emancipation Act is one of disfranchisement. The Clare election, that contest which brought the Catholic question to a crisis, and proved to the government of the day that the wishes and feelings of the Irish people could no longer be disregarded except at the risk of a civil war, was carried by the energy, the devotion, and the self-sacrifice of the forty-shilling freeholders, who at that time formed the mass of every county constituency in Ireland. But the contest which they won was fatal to them. Emancipation was granted, but these humble voters were at once disfranchised, and the right of voting at county elections was henceforth confined to a higher class of electors. The Irish Reform Act and the later statutes have not restored them their power, although by those acts the franchise was very much extended; and it may be doubted whether it is expedient to extend it



very much beyond its present limits. As matters stand at present, the 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ . occupation franchise in counties, and the 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ . occupation franchise, which were created by the statute 13 and 14 Vict. c. 69, give the right to vote to very nearly every one who could with any advantage be entrusted with that power. The Irish Reform Act which was passed in 1832 is by no means of that sweeping character which distinguishes the previous English statute for amending the laws relating to the representation of the people. Not a single borough was disfranchised by the Irish Act. That reform had already been sufficiently effected by the Act of Union. But the Irish Reform Act did considerably augment the number of voters by extending the franchise to leaseholders who had not previously enjoyed it; and, as we have stated, of late years even a further extension has been made, and political power thus more and more thrown into the hands of the Irish people. The Act also gave the right of returning an additional member to certain boroughs, amongst others to the University of Dublin, but it did not redistribute the right of representation, as was done by the English statute. Another Act, of which the importance was perhaps more strongly felt than that of the Reform Act, was the statute which had for its object the reform of the Irish municipal corporations. Before it became law, the entire government of Irish local bodies was in the hands of the party whose ascendancy had received such a fatal blow in Catholic emancipation. Had it not been for the Act of which we speak, that power would still, at the moment at which we are writing, remain as it was. The Irish municipal bodies were one and all, and none more so than in the Irish capital, strongholds of Orangeism. For years Catholics had been excluded by law from the local councils. Even to form part of the legal body of burgesses, to be admitted to the freedom of the boroughs or cities in which they dwelt, was long denied to them; and when the law itself was changed, and they were theoretically put upon an equality with their fellow-subjects, practically they remained in their old position. The old corporations continued to exert as much jealousy in the exclusion of Papists after emancipation as before. Catholics were entitled to aspire to municipal honours, and to be admitted as freemen; but the municipal honours were already in safe hands, which knew very well how to keep up the monopoly that had so long existed, and those who were in possession of the freedom, and had the power of transmitting it, were likely to take good care that no large body of Popish freemen should ever grow up to disturb the repose of their former masters. The old corporations were, so to speak, the last asylums of

ascendancy, and from those asylums the statute which we are speaking of came to expel it. The old governing bodies were broken up. The importance of the freemen was very much diminished; and the councils of cities and boroughs were every where made elective assemblies, chosen by the free votes of those whose affairs they were to administer.

This statute was passed in the beginning of the reign of her present Majesty. In fact, little of permanent legislation important to Ireland was passed in the interval between the Catholic Relief Act and her accession. The National system of education was indeed inaugurated under King William; but it did not form the subject of parliamentary action, and therefore does not come within the scope of these pages. But with the accession of the Queen to the throne a period of greater activity commenced, and measures for Ireland became more frequent than they had previously been. Whether those measures were good or bad, whether they did not leave much untouched that required a remedy, is another question; but at least the fact is certain that since the year 1837 something has been done, and that, though coercion acts have been passed during that period, they do not, as was formerly too much the case, make up the entire chapter of legislation for Ireland.

We have spoken of the Municipal Corporations Reform Act. Previous to it in point of time came the first of the Irish Poor Law Acts, which was passed in the year 1838, and is quoted by lawyers as the 1 and 2 Vict. c. 56. This statute, with those which have been passed to alter and amend it, cannot be properly treated here. The subject, indeed, is not merely an Irish one. The terrible social question which lies at the bottom of it, the question of the condition of the poor, and of pauperism generally, is one which cannot but be of grave concern to every one who thinks at all of the future of England as well as of Ireland. For centuries, certainly since the Reformation annihilated the noble fund of charity which the Catholic religion had created, it has occupied the attention of all thinking men. It is the weak point of the empire, the one thing which foreigners point out as counterbalancing and even outweighing the greatness, the wealth, and the freedom of the British State. But terrible as the pauperism of England is, that of Ireland is, in its extent and depth, even more terrible. In one respect, however, the Irish pauper is in a better position than his English brother. Irish pauperism means poverty and distress of the worst description. It does not mean the ignorance, the brutality, and irreligion, of which so many public documents show the existence amongst the



English of a like class. The Irish labourer may live in the filthiest of hovels, his food may be of the lowest kind, he and his family may scarcely have rags enough to cover their nakedness, but, wretched as his plight may be, he at least has faith to sustain him through his trials, and in the practices of his religion, which he rarely neglects, he finds something which comforts and even ennobles him. Can the same be said of the English pauper? Yet the English poor were the objects of attention on the part of the government and the legislature long before the one or the other dreamed of devising any measure of relief for the enormous mass of distress which existed in Ireland. So long ago as the reign of Queen Elizabeth the first attempt was made to devise a system of public relief for English poverty. The system devised was in many respects harsh, and its administration was always characterised more by selfishness than by charity. But at least it ensured that none should die of actual want. In Ireland nothing worth speaking of was done before the statute of the first and second years of Queen Victoria. The destitute poor in Ireland depended for their subsistence upon the charity of individuals only, a resource which certainly seldom failed them. Indeed, when the question of introducing the poor-law system into Ireland was first mooted, there were grave differences of opinion among the Irish leaders as to the propriety of the step. O'Connell and those who thought with him were opposed to it. Dr. Doyle, on the other hand, the eloquent Bishop of Leighlin, one of the most vigorous minds that Ireland had ever produced, was in favour of the measure, and gave it a support which for a long time caused a feeling of at least coolness between him and O'Connell. The law was introduced. A commission board was appointed to direct the working of the system. The country was divided into unions; and boards of guardians, consisting partly of elected members, and partly of members who held their seats by virtue of their being magistrates, were established to administer the relief which the law directed them to give. The system thus introduced has now, after a lapse of so many years, failed to give satisfaction to the country. Questions are constantly starting up which give rise to a vast deal of angry discussion. The means provided for the performance of religious worship in workhouses, the religion of deserted children, the propriety of giving out-door relief, the appointment and salaries of chaplains,—all form so many topics of disputes which occasionally are very far from seemly, and are besides fertile subjects for agitation. Some of these questions are even now under the consideration of the legislature,

and the entire system may be said to have very few defenders, at least among Irish Catholics. Yet perhaps the law itself is not so much to be blamed as those who administer it. The composition of the Poor-Law Board, in the first place, is, to say the least, singularly unfortunate. There is not a single Catholic among its members, and the majority of them are Englishmen. This is a matter of serious concern when we consider that, more than any other system, the poor law from its very nature requires a sympathy between the subjects of the law and those who administer it. The presence of one or two Catholics upon the board would have prevented several of the discussions which have arisen within the last few years, especially upon those delicate subjects where the wishes of the Catholic Episcopacy and those of the commissioners have clashed. Again, a vast deal is said upon the subject of outdoor relief, and the Irish poor law in this respect is compared disadvantageously with that which prevails in England. No doubt, outdoor relief is more generously given in England than in Ireland; yet the Irish guardians are by no means deprived of power to give that relief if they choose. The classes of persons to whom it may be given certainly are fewer in Ireland than in England; but, taking the limits of their authority into consideration, those who administer the system in Ireland might do a great deal more than they do at present, and really ought to be made to bear very much of the blame which is usually heaped upon the law. The law no doubt requires reform in many respects; but without a change of feeling in the minds of guardians and commissioners, no amount of improvement in the letter of the code can be of much avail. Not that we undervalue or would do any thing to hinder the efforts of those who are endeavouring to force the shortcomings of the Irish poor law upon the attention of Government. To those shortcomings, to the positively unchristian character of much of the system, we are as fully alive as any one can be, and we are as anxious as any for its reform; but we feel that independently of the legislature much might be done by individuals. We know instances in which much has been so done, and no doubt the number of similar instances might be largely increased by individual energy, attention, and charity. Probably there are not at present many people who believe that it would be better for the country if there was no system of public relief adopted at all. Some such ideas were entertained when the Poor Law was first spoken of; but the experience of the dreadful years extending from 1846 to 1852 must have driven them from nearly every mind. Frightful as were the sufferings of the



people during that period, they assuredly would have been very much worse had there been no poor law in existence. Even apart from a famine, let us take a case which is provided for by the statute 11 and 12 Vict. c. 47. Suppose a number of small cottiers, whose whole dependence was upon the little piece of land which they cultivated, were evicted by process of law from their holdings. The case is one which has been of too frequent occurrence to be thought imaginary. What would those unfortunate people do? To whom would they turn? Their neighbours are as poor as themselves; the gentry have small sympathy with them. But for the law they must absolutely perish. Fortunately the statute to which we have just referred requires that when any evictions by process of law are about to take place, notice of them shall be given beforehand to the relieving officer of the district, who is authorised to afford temporary relief to the poor people who are thus thrown upon the world. The same statute, which is one marked by more consideration for the poor than most of those laws which deal with the relative positions of the humble and the wealthy, makes it a misdemeanour to unroof or demolish any dwelling-house so long as any persons remain in it. The circumstances of the country therefore seem imperatively to require that there should be a poor law of some sort, although the present system requires great amendment in several respects. Most of all, it requires such amendment as may bring it into harmony, if that can at all be done, with the feelings of a Catholic people. But in truth its failings in this respect are only the failings of the whole body of the law, of the entire legal and constitutional system which so unnaturally prevails in Ireland. So long as the Church Establishment exists, so long as the religion of the majority of the people is legally ignored, and that of the very small minority pampered and caressed, we cannot wonder if every thing resembling a Catholic spirit is carefully excluded from any one branch of the law. Something indeed has been done since 1829 to mitigate at least, though not fundamentally to remedy, the grievous wrongs which result from the existence of an alien establishment, and in some slight degree to recognise the existence of the Church of the nation. Very few and very slight those measures are, yet, in the examination which we are at present making, they cannot be passed over.

In the first place, one of the most fertile sources of Irish discontent and crime has been totally closed up. Tithes have completely disappeared. No one who has studied the history of Ireland is ignorant of the amount of outrage to which their collection formerly gave rise. They were, indeed, the most

oppressive tax to which a country could be subject. Levied from the immediate cultivator of the soil, constantly fluctuating in amount, collected by agents the most harsh and unfeeling, and intended for the support of a Church which the peasantry hated, they formed the grievance which lay at the bottom of a great deal of angry feeling on the part of the Irish people towards England. From time to time, that angry feeling burst forth into crime of the worst description, and that crime frequently assumed the proportions of civil war. By what penal enactments the outrages of the peasantry were met we have already stated. But it was at last seen that merely repressive legislation was not sufficient for the occasion, and a succession of statutes, from the fourth year of the reign of King George IV. to the first and second years of her present Majesty, was passed, by which an attempt was made to apply some permanent remedy to an evil which threatened the entire social state of Ireland with disorganisation. The first two of these statutes provided for certain compositions being made, which at least would have the effect of taking away from tithe one of its most odious characteristics, namely, its uncertainty. For a variety of reasons, however, these compositions did not give satisfaction. They were not found to give relief to the payers of tithe, and the collection of the tax was attended with as much disorder and crime as ever. At last a bold step was taken. The composition was converted into a permanent rent-charge, and the immediate liability to the payment of that rent-charge was thrown upon the owners of the inheritance of the land. In this way the tithe difficulty was solved. The wretched occupier of the land was relieved on the one hand, while, on the other, the owners of tithe obtained a fixed and permanent property, the collection of which no longer required the aid of military force. Disputes about tithe have now passed from the region of the Criminal Courts, where formerly they were most frequently entertained and decided, to the more peaceable arena of the Court of Chancery.

The next statute to which we have to refer is the Charitable Bequests Act, which was passed in the seventh and eighth years of her Majesty's reign. It is worthy of note that until the passing of this Act the only laws affecting gifts for charities in Ireland were the old statutes of the Plantagenets. No such Act as the Mortmain Act of George II. existed in Ireland. But where the entire system of law was based upon an opposition to Catholicism, the absence of any particular statute mattered little. No court in Ireland would, for a long series of years, have carried out any Catholic charitable trust; and perhaps the first symptom of any thing like justice or



liberality on the subject being understood in the Irish courts was Curran's decision in the case of *Merry v. Power*, in which, to the great astonishment of the bar of those days, he upheld the validity of a bequest for pious uses. A permanent board of commissioners for watching over charitable bequests was constituted in the year 1800 by one of the last acts of the Irish Parliament. This board was purely Protestant; and though it suited the times in which it was formed, its constitution was not at all in harmony with the increased liberality of more recent days. Accordingly, in the year 1844, the statute of which we are now speaking was enacted. It created a new board of commissioners, to consist of the Master of the Rolls, the Chief Baron, the Judge of the Prerogative Court, and ten other persons to be appointed by the Crown, of whom five were to be Catholics. Amongst its most important enactments is that which directs the consideration of all charitable donations and bequests in which any question shall arise as to the usages or discipline of the Catholic Church to be referred to a committee of the Catholic Commissioners, who are also empowered to certify to the board the persons intended to take the benefit of any trust in cases where, by reason of any reference to the usages of the Church, the object of the donation shall not be defined with legal certainty in the instrument creating the trust. The Act contains also a very important provision which enables persons who wish so to do to vest lands, goods, and chattels in the commissioners for any of these three purposes:—first, for building or furnishing Catholic places of worship; secondly, for any Catholic Archbishop or Bishop, or other person in orders, officiating in any district, or having pastoral superintendence of any Catholic congregation, “and for those who shall from time to time so officiate, or shall succeed to the same pastoral superintendence;” or, thirdly, for building a residence for the use of the last-mentioned persons. We suppose that this section is the only one to be found in any statute relating to Ireland which recognises at all the succession of the Catholic Episcopacy and clergy, or professes to deal with them in any other capacity than that of individuals merely. There is but one other section in the Act which it is necessary to mention. It is that which requires deeds and wills containing donations or bequests for pious or charitable purposes to be executed three months before the death of the person executing them, and which, in the case of deeds, directs that they shall be registered within three months after their execution. As we have already stated, this is the only Irish statutory provision since the old mortmain laws of the Edwards which interferes

with the liberty of disposing of landed property, whether by deed or by will, for charitable purposes.

When to this act we add the increased grant for the support of the College of Maynooth, we have pretty nearly all that has been done to recognise the Catholic Church in Ireland, and countervail the mischief of the Establishment. With respect to other legislation we have now little to add. There are few additional statutes upon which we should be justified in dwelling, and the chief of them, the Encumbered Estates Act, though of vast importance, is a measure so familiar to every one, that any thing that we could say of it, in the pages of this Article, which can only pretend to give a general view of legislation, would be superfluous. It is sufficient to mention it and to acknowledge its importance. Fisheries acts, linen acts, acts providing for the execution of public works, acts enabling the landlord to borrow money for improvements, and acts providing for the supply of assistance to the poor man by the establishment of loan-fund societies,—of all these statutes we would gladly say something. So too those enactments which provide for the administration of cheap justice, the statutes regulating the constitution of the County Courts, and more especially those which have made the jurisdiction of magistrates at petty sessions a benefit to the country, instead of being, what in old times it too often was, a source of the most disgraceful corruption, would certainly claim our consideration, if space and time permitted. To go regularly through all these Acts of Parliament would, however, be quite beyond the scope of our Article. But before we conclude our sketch, we must not omit to refer to the Act 8 and 9 Vict. c. 66, which established the three new colleges in Cork, Belfast, and Galway, which are known as the Queen's Colleges. This Act gives a sum of 100,000*l.* for building those institutions, and endows them besides with an annual income of 21,000*l.* That they have wholly failed is a fact which can scarcely be denied, except by some very enthusiastic supporters of the mixed system of education; and it is full time that the country should be relieved from the burden of providing salaries for professors without students, and scholarships for a very limited number of competitors.

We have now laid before our readers a sketch, slight indeed, but accurate, so far as it goes, of the course of legislation which has been adopted for Ireland since the year 1829. The laws which have been so enacted are, as our readers must have perceived, very varied in their character. Some of them are purely penal and repressive. Of those which are remedial and improving, in their object at least, if not always in their



effect, some are of a purely political nature ; some have grave social matters for their subjects ; some are of an educational character ; others again do away with the most harsh and oppressive features of the supremacy of the Established Church, or give some slight recognition to the Church of the people. On the whole, it seems to result from our review, that the character and tendency of imperial legislation for Ireland has decidedly improved since Catholics were admitted to share in the benefits of the constitution. There have been at least no laws passed, with one exception, which permanently restrict the liberties of Catholics as individuals, or of their Church as a body. The exception is of course the Ecclesiastical Titles Act. We omitted to refer to it before for two reasons. In the first place, we have been dealing with legislation peculiarly Irish ; and the statute in question is English as well as Irish, and, indeed, was principally aimed at the Church in England. In the next place, it has been so ludicrously ineffective, so completely a failure, that in itself it scarcely deserves a moment's consideration. It remains simply a monument of impotent malignity and folly. But when we come to consider the position of the Catholic Church in Ireland with reference to the law, the first thing which we cannot fail to observe is the great liberty it enjoys. It has no recognised public position ; no honours are paid to it or its ministers. Legally it is in a position of most unjust inferiority. But in spite of these great disadvantages, perhaps even in some sense in consequence of them, the Church has more freedom of action in Ireland than in many countries where it enjoys honours and privileges which are there unknown to it. Irish Catholics have very much upon which they may congratulate themselves ; but this consideration must not blind them, or their leaders, to the disadvantages under which they, their country, and their religion, do yet undoubtedly labour. Much, very much, remains to be done before the work of emancipation can be said to be complete. Too much has been done in the way of legislation to repress and punish ; too little in the way of legislation to improve. The wishes and feelings of the Irish people have never yet been fairly consulted or considered in their government. Many most important questions remain without even an attempt being made to solve them, in spite of the very just discontent which the delay excites. In a country where the members of one religion, after all the sufferings which they have gone through, are yet as four to one to those of the other, the majority are still taxed to support the religious establishment of the minority—of a minority even of that minority, when we

take into consideration the relative numbers of Protestant Dissenters, and of the members of the Church of the State. This is a condition of things which is unexampled in the history of the world. Go where we will, in the old world or in the new,—in the freedom of America, or in those lands whose strivings for freedom, if freedom it be that they are striving for, excite so much sympathy among the people of England,—we shall find no such grievance as this. So long as it exists, there must be discontent in Ireland. So long as it exists, Irish Catholics may be, as they ought to be, loyal, but they cannot feel that active and hearty attachment to the system under which they live which would assuredly spring up amongst them if this grievance were removed. Let Englishmen make the case their own. What would our feelings be if in our own country twenty millions of Protestants had to pay for the support of the worship of two or three millions of Catholics scattered here and there through the country, in congregations sometimes of two or three hundred, sometimes of ten or twenty, sometimes even of less? It is any thing but likely that we should exhibit a tithe of the patience with which the Catholics of Ireland have for years borne an analogous state of circumstances. How would any proposal be received in Parliament to confiscate the funds which support the paganism of Hindostan, and apply them to the propagation of Christianity in that region? We have no doubt of the answer which would be given to any one who might be bold enough to bring forward such a measure. He would be told that England could not afford to cope with the disaffection which such a confiscation would engender; that his proposal was that of a man who knew how to lose a state, but not how to govern it. Yet just such a confiscation is, in spite of every warning, perpetrated in Ireland to this hour, though it must be remembered, however, that Irish Catholics do not seek to have the property of which their Church was plundered restored to it; but simply to be released from the burden of supporting a Church with which their nation will have nothing to do. The great question of Irish politics is the question of the existence of the Establishment, but there are other questions also. Even as we write, a special commission is attempting to exact punishment for the fearful murders which within the last few weeks have reddened the soil of Limerick and Tipperary. It is just that the assassin should be made to pay the penalty of his crime; but it is not just or statesmanlike that those who rule us should pertinaciously close their ears to the voices which tell them, year after year, that the relation between landlord and tenant in



Ireland is radically bad, and that some legislative action must be taken to amend it. It is not right that when the country is enjoying an interval of prosperity the subject should be scouted as impertinent, and that when the peasant is goaded to crime by wretchedness the advocates of land reform should be told that Government will hold no parley with assassins. With regard to the land question, nothing, absolutely nothing, has been done, or even attempted. Irishmen who know and love their country have spoken; thinkers like Mr. Mill have written; foreign travellers have long ago stated their opinions; but Whig and Tory governments alike have remained inert; and proclamations, disarmings, and the gallows, have been the philosophical means employed for solving one of the most important questions of the day. Again, can any one who has considered the subject doubt that some reform in the poor laws, and especially in their administration, is necessary? Another question of grave importance is that of education. The Government has established certain colleges which have notoriously failed. The Catholic people have largely subscribed to establish a university where education in its higher stage may be carried on upon Catholic principles; and they ask unanimously that that university should obtain a charter. But Government has a hobby,—we can give it no other term,—and whether the Irish people wish for it or not, and though the whole system of education in England is based upon a totally different idea, Ireland is to be forced to adopt mixed education, for no conceivable reason that we can discover, except that the country shows an unmistakeable aversion to it. And this is done with regard to Ireland, when every country on the Continent of Europe sees the necessity of basing education on religion, and when England, both in her own case and in the case of her colonies, takes the same course. The Established Church, then, the land laws, the poor laws, and education, form four great questions, upon the discussion and right solution of which Catholic Irishmen have a peculiar right to insist. They are four subjects upon which legislation has been sadly deficient, and until the deficiency is supplied it must always give a legitimate ground for complaint.

But, on the other hand, it must be admitted that though these reasons for discontent exist, yet when Catholics compare their present position with that which they occupied before 1829, and the course of legislation which has been pursued since that period with that which took place before it, and especially before the Union, they have the strongest reason to congratulate themselves on the altered condition

of their affairs. They were slaves; they are free. Formerly laws were made against them; now they are at least left in peace; or such laws as have been made are, if not every thing that could be wished, yet in the main favourable to them. There still remains much to be done; but what so remains can be attained without exciting those bitter feelings which were inseparable from the old agitation. Above all, it can be attained without banding Irishmen together in hostility to England, or causing Englishmen to look upon Irishmen as irreconcilable enemies to the unity of the empire. Whatever subjects are to be discussed, whatever questions are to be agitated, we do in the strongest manner protest against those who would perpetuate a feeling of national estrangement between England and Ireland. They are one country, and the idea of separating them is an idle dream. To foster a spirit of hostility between them as between two nations is a great crime. There has been enough and too much of that hostility in former days. Irish Catholics ought at present to seek the reform of their grievances as grievances which one body of the people in the country are suffering at the hands of another body in the same country. They ought to look upon themselves in relation to the other members of the empire as the Catholics, let us say, of Holland or of Prussia, look upon themselves in relation to the rest of the population of those kingdoms. On the other hand, let the people of England deal justly with the Irish Catholics. Let them at least hear calmly what the latter have to say, and not leap to the conclusion that because there is discontent expressed at grievances there is therefore a longing for separation. That a party which fosters such a longing does exist in Ireland is unfortunately true; but it is a small party at present, and one which has no real influence upon the great mass of the people. If it ever attains such an influence, it will do so by the aid of those who, for whatever purposes and from whatever point of view, dissociate the course of British legislation from the redress of substantial injustice; for it is only by the full recognition of every right, and the complete removal of every legitimate grievance, that England and Ireland can ever become in reality, what they are in name, a United Kingdom.

---



## PRUSSIA AND THE GOTHA PARTY.

THE remarkable movement which has started from the German Universities, and, founding itself on a particular view of the events of the last three centuries, now acts so powerfully on the politics of the whole country, and especially of Prussia, cannot be understood without a retrospect of the actual history of Germany in connection with her historical literature. It is only by this combination that we can explain a state of affairs in which learned men are the most influential politicians, ponderous histories are the most effective pamphlets, and political speculation is almost entirely superseded by the practical influence of historical research.

Macaulay, in one of his Essays, has pointed out the contrast between the historical literature of England and that of other countries, and particularly of France. Political continuity has there been interrupted by the Revolution, and the state of things is so completely new that the study and description of former times, though it may retain scientific interest, has no greater practical importance than that of ancient Greece or Rome. It is otherwise in England, where there has been no violent interruption of continuity, and where a precedent from remote ages may rule the cases of our own time. History with us has a real practical interest. Although the old parties are extinct, they have legal representatives, and each opinion appreciates the past in conformity with its own tendencies, and with reference to possible consequences for itself. Hence English historians betray the prejudices of their party, and the position of the writer is a greater obstacle to impartial narrative than it is in France. Men of different parties find it more easy in France to come to an agreement on the period of Henry IV. or of Lewis XIV. than it is for Englishmen to agree in their judgment on Charles I. or William III. Macaulay himself was an instance of the truth of his saying about England. Whether his antithesis, however, is just or unjust in the case of France, it certainly does not apply to Germany. Though there has been no revolution, yet the fall of the empire in 1806 amounted to a complete breach in the national tradition. But the events that happened before that date have not merely an antiquarian interest for the Germans of our own day, since there is no country whose history is judged more variously according to the party to which the writer belongs, or in which historical literature is more deeply affected

by political sympathies. The many streams of opinion that manifest themselves may be referred to two principal sources of difference: the religious antagonism of Catholics and Protestants, and the political rivalry between Austria and Prussia. The historian's view of the past is determined by his attachment to one or other of these interests; and the political and religious division do not exactly correspond. In the smaller states the feeling is not always absolutely on the side of either of the great Powers: they are grouped partly according to other considerations. And all these combinations react on historical views, and seek in them their root and nourishment. The modern history of Germany is the key to the present distribution of German parties in politics and literature.

In a well-known passage of the *Essay on Ranke's History of the Popes*, Macaulay draws a comparison between Catholic and Protestant countries,—England and Denmark on the one hand, Spain and Portugal on the other,—which leads to the conclusion that Protestant nations have made decidedly greater progress than their neighbours in arms, arts, sciences, letters, commerce, and agriculture. The instances are correct, but the generalisation is wrong; for in all these cases the contrast lies in the difference of race. If the comparison is made where the religious diversity exists without the other decisive element of difference, the conclusion is not confirmed. Germany supplies the best instance of a contrary kind. Before the Reformation it had reached the highest point of its power and prosperity. It was the first of European nations. The flag of the Hanse Towns ruled the waves throughout the Northern seas, and our sovereigns, down to the reign of Elizabeth, confirmed the privileges which placed the trade of England in the hands of the German merchants. The city of Lubeck bestowed the crowns of Sweden and Denmark, and protected her candidate with her fleet. The wealth of the inland towns corresponded with that of the great ports. They were the centre of European commerce. In all Europe, says Æneas Sylvius, you will not find a city that can compare in splendour with the ancient Cologne on the Rhine. The rich citizens of Strasburg and Frankfort dwell in houses fit for kings, and the kings of Scotland might be thankful to be lodged like the middle class of burghers at Nuremberg. No country in Europe can equal the Germans in rich and splendid towns. These towns, which were so flourishing in the fifteenth century, afterwards became Protestant, and their fate bears no satisfactory testimony to the influence attributed to Protestantism on material well-being.



The influence of the Reformation on the political state of Germany was deeper and more conspicuous. At its commencement the empire exhibited a group of loosely-connected territories. There was a supreme elective head, surrounded with the mystic glory of the imperial dignity of ancient Rome, who preserved the national unity, as the temporal chief of Christendom. He alone enjoyed the title of majesty, which was given to none of the other sovereigns, who ranked with the electors of the empire. But an administration of the empire by the Emperor, so far as the notion of administration was known in those days, did not exist. The actual government of the country was in the hands of the territorial princes; that of the towns was exercised by the magistrates. None of these authorities were absolute. The princes were controlled by the estates, the magistrates by the town-councils. At the Diet the electors, the princes, the imperial nobles, and the magistrates of the Free Cities, assembled to meet the Emperor. The corporative system was carried out to its final consequences; and through this system of corporations the German nation was the first in the world.

This was changed at the Reformation. All European countries at that time display a tendency towards a more compact arrangement, a greater concentration of authority, and the modern pattern of government. This tendency showed itself strongly in Germany under Maximilian I. There was a scheme to establish a general tax, a system of customs on all the frontiers of the empire, and a series of uniform and centralised institutions. The perpetual peace, the imperial Chamber of Justice, and the division of the empire into circles, were actually introduced, when Luther proclaimed his new gospel of justification by faith alone. That doctrine opened the way for the creation of new authorities, and the extension of some that subsisted before. In separating from the Catholic Church, the princes, while they recognised the necessity of a supreme ecclesiastical government, combined that office with the secular power in their own hands. Luther's system, moreover, cut away the foundation of Church property, and the wealth of the clergy lapsed to the sovereigns. They either kept it for themselves, or shared it with those who had aided in effecting the change, and who were ready to acknowledge the lawfulness of the union of spiritual and temporal power in the same person. This is the common character of the policy of such princes as Gustavus Wasa and Henry VIII., though it was modified by local circumstances, and though the brutality of Henry

makes him appear in a darker light. The crown reaped the chief advantage. In France the same result was attained by the contrary process. There the Crown adhered to the old faith, and Calvinism was the banner under which the nobles attacked it. But the crown prevailed over the nobles, and pursued its victory till it had cast them to the ground. Henry IV. headed the Protestant nobility in its rebellion against the House of Valois; and his grandson saw their descendants cringing at his feet, and proud to sacrifice their wives and daughters to his pleasure.

It was otherwise in Germany. If the Emperor Charles V. was ever visited by the temptation to unite in his hands the ecclesiastical with the civil supremacy, and to take possession of the property of the Church, there is no trace to show that he entertained the thought even for a moment. His position differed from that of other monarchs. He was the appointed guardian of the Church, the secular head of Christendom; and the peculiar character which has always belonged to the House of Habsburg displayed itself remarkably in him. That character is essentially conservative, and devoted to the maintenance of existing rights. It has been deficient, through apathy or inactivity, but not aggressive. For the other German princes the doctrines of Luther opened the way to independent sovereignty; and they pursued it, though slowly and timidly at first. Philip of Hesse gave the example, and was the first to apply to France for aid in accomplishing the German revolution. Francis I. did not hesitate to grant it; and it enabled Philip and his friends to complete their undertaking.

In its character, this reformation resembled those of Sweden, Denmark, and England, inasmuch as the princes in each case took possession of the Church property and instituted a royal supremacy. It differed from them, because in the other countries the Reformation strengthened the crown and the unity of the state; while in Germany it gave all the advantage to the rulers of the several territories, brought them into permanent opposition to the head of the empire, and thus undermined the stability of the empire, which was occupied at the same time by the Turks and the King of France. But for the pressure of those powers, and the constant active intervention of the French king, the Reformation, that is, the dissolution of the empire into the territorial authorities, would never have succeeded. We are concerned here only with the political aspect of the event. It is another question whether the men of those days willingly and zealously accepted the new faith,—a question which



it requires no great knowledge of mankind to answer. Whatever may be the truth or excellence of a new doctrine, it can never suddenly command the adhesion of a majority of men, if it is in contradiction to the tradition and habits of ages. The fact is, that in each country the sovereign required his subjects to adopt his own religious confession, and tolerated none besides. The German princes did not coerce their people by the scaffold and the stake to adopt the new doctrine, but permitted those who could not conform to go into banishment. This was the system afterwards proclaimed in the technical formula: *Cujus regio, ejus religio*.

The movement which was begun in this way could not fail, in its consequences, to involve the ruin of the empire. The Emperor believed it to be his duty and his right to uphold the established order; while those princes who had resolved to effect the change endeavoured to deprive him of the means of resistance, and reckoned for the purpose on foreign help. Then began the melancholy and degrading characteristic of later German history, that the princes of Germany, whenever they entertained a design to strengthen themselves at the expense of their neighbours, looked with hope and confidence to France. On the other hand, the means were supplied to France of using the Germans against each other, either by giving actual assistance to one party, or by inducing one half of the princes to remain neutral while she fought with the other half.

A collision between the Emperor Charles V. and the princes who were in league with France was inevitable. It came in 1547. It cannot be called a contest between the Protestant princes and the Emperor, for Maurice of Saxony and Joachim of Brandenburg were on the imperial side. Nor can it be said that Philip of Hesse and John Frederick of Saxony fought for religion; for their armies consisted of mercenaries, and the people of Saxony and Hesse took part in the war only by their sufferings. No cause was at stake in which the subjects of the Protestant leaders felt an interest. The Emperor triumphed over his enemies, and beheld them at his feet. If at any time he had cherished visions of an hereditary or universal empire, the power to realise it was now in his hands. As he had overcome the princes who had risen against him, he might overcome the others. He could confiscate the lands of the rebels, and keep them for himself. He did not do it. He summoned a Diet, before which he declared that his purpose was conciliation. He called the most moderate divines of both parties together, and caused

them to draw up a scheme which all might accept until the council had decided. Charles V. imagined that agreement was still possible. But while he was negotiating Maurice of Saxony suddenly changed sides. He had obtained from Charles all that the laws of the empire allowed the Emperor to bestow,—the electoral coronet and a part of the dominions of his cousin John Frederick. But he longed for more. He applied for assistance to Henry II. of France, and obtained it for the treasonable price of the three bishoprics,—Metz, Toul, and Verdun. Then he turned upon the sick and unarmed Emperor, and compelled him to fly at night, by the glare of torches, over the mountains into Tyrol. The result was the Peace of Religion concluded at Augsburg, by which the ecclesiastical sovereignty of the princes was legally established in every German state.

The treason had succeeded. It became the office of history to justify, or at least to excuse, it. The French affirmed that Maurice, their ally, had baffled the ambitious designs of Charles V. The German princes wished this to be believed, and Philip of Hesse made Sleidanus write the history of the events. The work was in part completed before Charles V. ended his life at San Juste. The aged Emperor had it read to him, and exclaimed, from time to time, "*Mentitur nebulo.*" But the words of Charles are forgotten. They were never heard by the Germans, and the work of Sleidanus is still read, quoted, and believed as an authentic and impartial narrative. Here too began the long series of the sins of omission of which the House of Habsburg has been guilty from an inability to comprehend the importance of the influence which history exercises over the inclinations and aversions of mankind. Nothing of equal weight was opposed to the works of Sleidanus and his party.

The Peace of Religion seemed to have composed the dissensions of the empire. The imperial authority had lost reputation, but had not fallen. The peculiar character of the reigning House was again displayed in a respect for existing rights. The imperial government observed the treaty of peace, and committed no outrage. The Lutheran princes acknowledged the equity of its policy. The descendants of Maurice attached themselves to the imperial party, and exhibited the old fidelity. Catholics and Lutherans lived at peace with each other, and the endeavour to dissolve the empire passed into the hands of another party, whose chiefs were the Calvinist princes in the Palatinate and Hesse Cassel. The achievements of William of Nassau in the Netherlands excited their emulation. Many ecclesiastical principalities sub-



sisted, which awakened the desire of dividing them. Henry IV. of France founded his plans of aggrandisement on this feeling, and promised to aid in satisfying it. The basis of his great scheme of a Christian republic was the partition of Germany. A policy of aggression and robbery is never at a loss for a decent and sonorous name. Under Henry's auspices, his Calvinist allies in Germany concluded the alliance which was called the Union; and the menaced princes sought protection in the Catholic League. A general conflagration of Germany promised to be the first consequence of Henry's design, when the dagger of Ravallac postponed its execution for Richelieu.

The leaders of the Calvinist party found themselves deprived of a head, but they were resolved not to lose the fruit of their preparations. An opportunity for action arose in Austria. The nobles and great proprietors in the hereditary states resolved to make use of Protestantism against their sovereign in the way in which the princes had used it against the head of the empire. They demanded what was called freedom of conscience, that is, the surrender of ecclesiastical supremacy to the landlord on his own estate. The disputes of the brothers Rudolph and Mathias gave them what they wanted. Then they went farther, and insisted that only the Protestant, but not the Catholic, landowners should enjoy this privilege of religious freedom. The imperial statesmen who resisted their demand were flung out of the windows of the palace at Prague, and the Thirty Years' war began. Frederick, the Elector Palatine, and the Calvinists rejoiced, for they thought their time was come. The Palsgrave was elected king of Bohemia, but enjoyed only the name. The nobles retained the supreme power in their own hands, and proclaimed a religious war.

No European nation has ever undergone such unutterable violence and misery as this act brought down on Germany. The people did not take part in the war, but bore the intolerable evils it caused. Whenever it seemed to flag, and a prospect of peace opened out before them, a little money served to inflame it anew. At first the money came from the Low Countries, where it was feared that the strengthening of the House of Habsburg by the peace of the empire might increase the power of Spain. They incurred no great sacrifices. It was sufficient to supply some adventurer with a hundred thousand florins, and to escort him over the German frontier. A standard was set up, recruiting commenced, the watchword was Religion, and all the rabble assembled to rob and plunder, to murder and destroy, in its name. The army grew

with the rapidity of an avalanche. Wherever it went, it was followed by its inseparable companions, pestilence and famine; and when the imperial forces appeared, it was beaten down. Meantime the cities fell into decay, grass grew in the streets, whole villages were annihilated, the country became desolate, and for miles together every sign of cultivation disappeared. This was the first act of the war. In the next, a crowned head, the King of Denmark, appeared, lured by the desire of the ecclesiastical territories of the North. Although a Lutheran himself, he obtained money from the Calvinist states of Holland, from the friendly James I. of England, from Cardinal Richelieu, and from the Signory of Venice; whilst Turkish invasion was reckoned upon as a diversion. All these states were interested in the disturbance of Germany, in order to prevent the revival of the imperial power. The support of the people was obtained by the pretext of religion. King Christian ravaged and sacked, like his predecessors, not in the Catholic territories, for he never reached them, but only in lands belonging to rulers of his own Lutheran faith. This lasted until the imperialists, under Tilly, overtook and defeated him.

Again an act of the drama had been played, and a new champion arose in the person of the King of Sweden. No German had invoked his aid, and the Lutheran Duke of Pomerania besought him to spare his land. Gustavus Adolphus answered that he came, without being summoned, for the purpose of giving to the Germans that religious freedom which they did not possess. The treasures of Richelieu did not fail him, and he was abler than the Dane. Gustavus knew the power of the press. He had writings circulated through France to the effect that the war he came to wage was not a war of religion, but aimed at the ruin of the House of Austria. In Germany he swore by all that was sacred that he came only for the sake of religion. At first he did not succeed, and for a whole year his mercenaries sustained themselves by plunder. Then came a terrible catastrophe over Germany. Tilly was defeated by the Swedes, and their successes followed rapidly. Gustavus assured the German citizens of his vocation to save the freedom of conscience; but while he raised one hand towards heaven, he pointed with the other to his guns. The trembling burghers hailed the foreign conqueror as their deliverer from a religious oppression which nobody had thought of. The iron hand of the Swedish King was upon them, and they obeyed. He marched from place to place, occupying the wealthy cities of Frankfort, Nuremberg, and Augsburg, which had never seen a hostile



army, and each of which was richer in the precious metals than the whole of his kingdom. Either of them might have arrested his progress, if it had had the resolution to do so. But they did not dare to resist; they threw open their gates; and Gustavus accepted or exacted enormous treasures in money, libraries, and works of art, which were sent home to Sweden. In return for all this, he professed to bring them freedom of conscience. He distributed the German territories he had conquered, and even those he had not yet invaded. In the bishoprics he obliged the inhabitants to swear allegiance to himself and to the heirs of the Swedish crown, and trampled under foot and contaminated all notions of duty and obedience. It did not last long. Death carried him away on the field of Lützen, and adorned the brow of the Northern invader with the crown of martyrdom for the Protestant faith.

Another act of the fearful war began. Those German princes who had joined Gustavus through cupidity or fear returned to the side of the Emperor, and concluded peace and alliance with him against the foreign intruders. But neither the French nor the Swedes had enough, and they were joined by a younger son of the Lutheran house of Saxe Weimar, and by the widow of the Calvinist Landgrave of Hesse Cassel. Bernard of Saxe Weimar gave way beneath the toils of his adventurous career; but the Landgravine continued the war for thirteen years, if war is not too noble a title for what followed. The series of the most diabolical acts that malice or avarice could devise, and the desolation of Germany in behalf of no principle whatever, is called a religious war, and there are writers who to this day give it that mendacious name, to serve the purposes of their party.

When peace arrived, men were debased to cannibals by hunger and despair. They hunted each other down with slings and traps, and devoured each other like wild-beasts. They dug up the churchyards to obtain corpses for their food. Parents slaughtered and cooked their children, and children gnawed the bones of their parents. But the war was over. When it began, Germany was the first of nations in intellectual cultivation, in literature, and in refinement. It had now become the last of all; but the chance of improvement was given by the return of peace.

The same literary endeavour appeared as before. Gustavus had caused books to be written in his defence, and Oxenstierna imitated his policy. Great folios were published to glorify the memory of the Swedish king, and when the wounds of the Germans began to heal, they learned their

history from these works. They learned that Gustavus Adolphus was a noble hero, and disinterested benefactor, who had come to protect religion. They saw, it is true, that the Swedes had retained for themselves the best coasts of Germany on the North Sea and the Baltic, and the Swedish war survived in the proverbs of their country as the worst of all calamities; but this was attributed to the Swedes in the later period of the war, and not to Gustavus himself, who was too honest and too good for that. By degrees the sons of those whom he had trampled under foot surrounded him with a halo of sanctity. The man who had carried an army of freebooters into Germany, unprovoked, without necessity and without cause, solely to satisfy his military ambition, and whom the misery of the exhausted and ruined country had not shamed from his false pretence of religion,—the author of all the evil became a deliverer and a saviour.

The Germans have no national history of that age capable of instructing them in the causes of the terrible disasters that befell them. There are three great contemporary works on the Thirty Years' war, written in German, which are of such importance that they are still reckoned the principal authorities, and are even supposed severally to represent the different interests and opinions. One is that of the Swedish historian Chemnitz, who wrote under the direction of the Chancellor Oxenstierna; another is the *Theatrum Europæum*, which was compiled at Frankfort as the war went on, under the shadow of the Swedish arms, and breathes a spirit of servility towards the conquerors; the third is the *Annales Ferdinandeï* of the Austrian Count Khevenhüller. In this last we might expect to find the imperial or national view of the war; yet there is very little, except the account of what the author himself saw on his embassy to Madrid, which is his own intellectual property. The greater part is transcribed from the *Theatrum Europæum*, and is impregnated therefore with Swedish tendencies.

There is one little book of those days written in the style of Tacitus, and glowing with an ardent patriotism. It was composed by Pappus, a canon of Constance, and is worth more than many folios; but the fate of this book affords an instance of the ignorance of the Germans about their own history. It was written in Latin, and remained unknown to many later writers, and was forgotten till a reprint was issued within the last few years. It is now sometimes mentioned or quoted by historians; but German literature has no history written in the tone and spirit of Pappus.

In the Peace of Westphalia, Mazarin dictated the conditions



at Munster, and Oxenstierna at Osnaburg. Germany was compelled to give up fair provinces to each power, and to allow the authority of the several princes to be increased at the expense of the Emperor. This had ever been the policy of France, who wished to be able on occasion to use the princes against the House of Austria. It was therefore stipulated that they should all enjoy the right of concluding alliances with foreign states. This was the point on which Lewis XIV. rested the lever with which he turned the German princes to account, both in his invasions of Holland, and in his wars with the empire. In another way, too, the policy of France played into the hands of the petty sovereigns. It was in the nature of things that all the conservative forces within the several territories, the estates and the municipalities, should enjoy the support of the Emperor. The great imperial tribunals at Spire and Vienna were a protection against unjust exactions on the part of the rulers. The power of these bodies was greatly reduced in consequence of the prolonged troubles of the war, but still they formed a barrier able to resist that tendency towards absolute monarchy which the example of Lewis XIV. encouraged in every German state. In order to become masters in their own land, the princes imposed conditions on successive emperors, which confined the imperial authority in the territories to the narrowest limits. A decree of the diet of the empire directed that the estates should not refuse their princes the means of an efficient defence. Therewith it became possible to maintain a standing army, and the standing army was a means of making the consent of the estates superfluous. Whenever a town, relying on the strength of its walls, dared to offer resistance, its insolence was put down. When the Elector of Mentz found himself unable with his own forces to compel Erfurt to submit, Lewis XIV. lent him French troops for the purpose, and Erfurt gave way. No German prince proceeded with so much energy in this course as Frederick William of Brandenburg. The estates of the principality had refused his father the supplies for maintaining an army of 900 men to garrison his fortresses. Frederick William waged long wars without consulting the estates. He had once obtained from them an excise on provisions, on the ground that it would be more convenient than the usual direct tax or contribution. He caused this grant to be renewed until its formal renewal had become unnecessary, and the military state began.

Hand in hand with the reduction of the supreme power, the restriction of the rights of corporations went on. The

authority of the princes grew in the same proportion upwards and downwards. The framework of the empire was loosened, but it was not broken up. There was still an imperial court, in which every German could prefer a complaint against his immediate sovereign. The Emperor was the suzerain feudal lord, the source of all jurisdiction. At his call the Germans still rose in arms against their hereditary foes in the East and the West, against the Turk and the French ; and when they followed his standard, they swore fidelity to the empire and the imperial crown, and fought together side by side on the Drave and the Po, as well as on the Rhine. In the West the empire suffered losses, chiefly in the hereditary dominions of the Austrian House, but in the East some compensation was obtained. In the broad plains of Hungary many a German from the Elbe or the Weser met his death. Hungary was more than once in the hands of the Turks, and was recovered, not with Hungarian blood, not only with the blood of Austrians, but with that of the people of Germany.

The attacks of France and Turkey were naturally directed against Austria, because the Austrian power was the bulwark of the empire and of the German nation. Whenever Austria fell, Germany would be ripe for partition. The German princes felt the danger, and they stood in general by the Emperor ; but France did not lack the means of undermining the sentiment of union. It was particularly urged that the connection was required for no public or common purpose, but only in the family interests of the House of Habsburg. For that alone, it was affirmed, the Emperor dragged the other Germans into wars in which none but he was concerned. At the time these efforts were ineffectual ; and the war of the Spanish Succession manifestly proved that the stake was not the private interest of the House of Austria, but the safety of all civilised Europe against the arbitrary will of a single potentate. It was at the same time easy to perceive that Austria never waged aggressive war, but fought only for defence. Throughout the end of the seventeenth century, down to the beginning of the eighteenth, the German princes, however ready they might be to accept the pensions of Lewis XIV., and to promote his interests for a time, more than their duty to the empire allowed, were yet not in a position permanently to escape the influence of gravitation towards Austria. This preponderance held the empire together. It tottered, but did not fall asunder ; and it would have been well for the safety of Germany and the peace of Europe if one of the Habsburgs had succeeded in drawing the bonds of union more firmly together. No such scheme ever arose, for



it was contrary to the traditionary policy of that conservative and unenterprising house. There was no reason to fear that any emperor would overstep the limits of the power which the peace of Westphalia had defined. Thus it came to pass that, towards the end of the seventeenth century, the princes entered into closer alliance and confidence with Leopold, the Protestant houses of Guelf and Hohenzollern at their head. The ablest of the Guelfic princes, the father of George I., was rewarded with the ninth electorate; and the Elector of Brandenburg was permitted to assume at Königsberg the royal crown for the duchy of Prussia, which was beyond the limits of the empire, and in which he enjoyed a perfectly independent sovereignty.

The power of the House of Brandenburg began early in the fifteenth century, when the Emperor Sigismund pledged Brandenburg to Frederick of Hohenzollern, Burgrave of Nuremberg, for 300,000 crowns in gold. Thenceforth the character of the house in the affairs of the empire was marked by an unswerving fidelity to the Emperor, which even the Reformation did not interrupt. In the rebellion of the other Protestant princes against Charles V., Joachim of Brandenburg maintained a strict neutrality, while he showed that his sympathies were on the imperial side. It has often been the policy of that family to remain neutral in critical conjunctures; but, as things stood in 1547, there was more to be gained with the Emperor than against him. Even the great Elector Frederick William, though he accepted a pension from France, did not join in any hostile act against the Emperor. Frederick I. was so absorbed in his scheme for obtaining the royal crown, that he showed on all occasions the strongest attachment to Leopold; and his son, Frederick William I., did the same, though he formed in other respects a striking contrast to his father. He dismissed all the courtiers at his accession, and placed his jester at the head of the Academy which had been presided over by Leibniz. He cared only for what was practical, and, that according to him, was the army alone. He had no wish to engage in war, and avoided it until Charles XII. compelled him to fight. His only motive was a love of parade. This passion went so far that there was one soldier in his army for every thirty of his subjects. In time of the profoundest peace he had 87,000 men under arms, with a population of two millions and a half. It was a mighty change since less than a century before, when the estates of Brandenburg had been able to prevent the great grandfather of Frederick William from raising a force of nine hundred men. No permission was asked for the army of 87,000.

Frederick William clad the descendants of the men who had refused the supplies in the blue uniform of his soldiers, and declared to the estates of Prussia that he was resolved to establish his sovereignty like a rock of adamant. But with all his military array, he had no bad intention and no thought of war, least of all against the Emperor. He hated the French as his uncle William of Orange hated them. No German monarch, he declared, could side with France unless he was a scoundrel. No thought ever entered into his mind of breaking up the empire. He would hold fast by the House of Austria, he declared, for with the House of Austria his own had prospered.

The empire was badly joined together, but still it maintained itself. Three of its electors wore foreign crowns—in Prussia, in Poland, and in England; but the imperial power was still supreme, and the three royal electors bowed to its interests like the rest. No German prince was so powerful or so unpatriotic as to enter into competition with the Emperor. The empire was loosened, but not divided; there was a multiplicity of powers, but not a dualism, when Frederick William I. closed his eyes. Frederick II. grasped his sceptre, and all seemed quiet for a time. Peace prevailed, and yet the burden of the army oppressed the country. Still Frederick levied new forces. His father had detested the French; *he* had long corresponded with Voltaire; and Frenchmen crowded to his court as they had assembled in Sweden before the expedition of Gustavus Adolphus. No such design was suspected in the new King of Prussia. He published a book against Machiavelli, and the Abbé de St. Pierre fell into an ecstasy at hearing the voice of justice and mercy, and the condemnation of all conquerors, proceeding from the throne. Meanwhile Frederick was arming, and the imperial ambassador reported from Berlin that matters looked alarming. He was told that his fears were groundless, and that an enmity on the part of a Hohenzollern against the empire was incredible and impossible. Frederick's father had guaranteed the Pragmatic Sanction, and the succession of Maria Theresa; Frederick did not express the least doubt of its validity, and the Emperor Charles VI. might die in peace.

He died in the autumn, while Frederick lay ill with fever. He had no more time to be sick. He took quinine against the orders of the physicians, asked his ministers and generals for their advice, laughed at them when they opposed his schemes, and set his troops in motion. He sent an envoy to Vienna to demand the cession of Silesia, and before his



envoy had reached Vienna his troops were in Silesia. The breach of faith and right was less prodigious than the perfidy with which he obtained auxiliaries. As he rode out of the gates of Berlin, he said to the French ambassador, "I believe I am playing your game; if I win, we shall divide the stakes." His other ally was fanaticism. Frederick, the friend of cynics and materialists, who set the highest proof of philosophy in atheism, caused his clergy to preach in all the churches that he was fighting for the Protestant religion against the Catholics. The words were successful, and he laughed with his unbelieving friends at the ease with which they were believed.

Frederick converted Prussia into a new state, for he gave that name to all his dominions, and called his people the Prussian nation. Thus he succeeded in forming a new centre of gravity in the empire. A dualism was established, and by the law of gravitation the lighter masses must follow the greater in critical times. Germany could no more be one, because there were two independent centres of attraction; and it could not unite, because the mode in which the second had arisen affixed the curse of hatred to it. The Prussian state was formed with the consciousness of guilt towards Austria, and the sense of this is ineffaceable. It is the same position which Protestantism occupies in the religious sphere towards Catholicism. There is an obscure feeling of the wrong which was done by the separation which still remains. It is vaguely felt by many, though distinctly understood by few, and contributes to make the mutual aversion greater on the Protestant than on the Catholic side. Catholicism stands on its own right, and has not to care for Protestantism. But Protestantism requires the shade of the Catholic Church that its own light may appear. Catholics may belong to their Church with the warmest attachment, without knowing that Protestantism exists. The zeal of a Protestant for his own religion is inseparable from his zeal against Catholicism.

The same feeling animates the Prussians towards Austria. The erection of a new centre in the German system was the act of one man, and it was done against the counsel of his ministers and officers. But it succeeded, and success bestowed a sanction upon it. It became necessary to justify the act and to establish the necessity of the new state. This is the office of that historical school which in recent times has been known by the name of the Gotha party. It is in the nature of things that this school could not confine itself to the one immediate object of justifying the policy of Frederick the Great against the House of Habsburg. In inseparable con-

nection with that particular act are the previous events and conditions out of which it arose, and the consequences it brought after it. We must look back for a moment to the point from which we started. The Reformation served as an occasion for the princes who accepted it to rebel against the Emperor and the unity of the empire, and enabled them to go on under that banner to a complete independence and sovereignty. France, we have seen, was at all times ready to encourage and support in Germany those movements which she repressed most energetically at home. This policy culminated under Richelieu, but it is in reality the same under the Valois and under the Bourbons. It achieved great results, and at one moment promised to triumph completely. For the price of the frontier of the Rhine, Richelieu was ready to support Gustavus Adolphus in the erection of his new Protestant empire; and the Swedish king had selected the long chain of ecclesiastical territories as the basis of his sovereign authority. His death baffled the design; and the empire, though greatly weakened, was not yet divided into two systems.

Frederick II. appeared as the heir of all these predecessors. All that Philip of Hesse, Maurice of Saxony, the Palgrave Frederick, and Gustavus Adolphus, had ever attempted, he attained. The others had prepared the way for him. He gathered the fruit of their labours. For that purpose he used the same means,—the invocation of French assistance, or rather the betrayal of Germany to France, and the excitement of fanaticism. The first was in his plans from the beginning. The other appears not to have been originally intended, because of his general indifference to every thing religious; and he was driven to adopt it in order to overcome the reluctance of his subjects to engage in the war. The desire of conquest does not reconcile the people to great sacrifices or wrong; they require some higher and more ideal motive, or at least the pretence of one, when their own interests are not immediately concerned. Frederick proclaimed a religious war, and thus entered fully into the footsteps of his predecessors. It enabled him to attain those ends in which they had only partially succeeded.

The first consequence was to increase the confessional antagonism, at least on the Protestant side. Till then, the hope of a reunion had survived, and its possibility had been assumed on almost every occasion,—at the Diet of Augsburg, the Peace of Religion, the Treaty of Munster, and in the efforts at reconciliation which were promoted by the Emperor Leopold, down to the beginning of the eighteenth century.



The policy of Frederick II. put an end, once for all, to the possibility of union. He had let fanaticism loose, and had conquered by its aid. Thenceforward Prussia and Protestantism were identical in the eyes of his subjects, and for him in his relations with them, whilst Austria and Catholicism shared the same aversion. When Frederick had once discovered the value of this ally, he was incessant in his endeavours to take advantage of it in every way. He invoked it in the first Silesian War, and again in the Seven Years' War. But it was not enough to present the phantom of his own religious war to his subjects, without explaining its origin by some device on the other side. There was no chance that Austria would afford an opportunity of the kind; and so Frederick resolved to supply it himself. He composed a letter from the Pope to Marshal Daun, made D'Argens to translate it into Latin, and then announced that it had been captured.<sup>1</sup> The artifice was successful, both at the time and afterwards in history.

As Frederick combined the schemes of those who had gone before him, in order to enjoy the fruit of what they had done, so the Prussian historians undertook the literary defence of those former endeavours which had prepared the way for Frederick's measures. The foremost writer of this class was the King himself. His activity in this department cannot be estimated too high. It is extraordinary both from its extent and its influence. As soon as a campaign was over, the King sat down to write the history of it in the way in which he wished it to be regarded by his subjects. He was neither a master of style nor of the language he used; but his French courtiers prepared his writings for publication. He did not confine himself to his own time. He experienced, as he says, the want of an historical literature for the past also, and he laboured to supply it. He wrote *Memoirs of the House of Brandenburg*, in which the fidelity of his ancestors to the crown and laws of the empire is represented as simplicity and foolishness, and in which he distributes praise and blame among them according as their actions resembled or differed from his own. In these literary plans he naturally found support among the French. The creation of a divided Germany was agreeable to the national feelings and policy of the French; and the parsimonious King was generous in his pensions to the Academicians of Paris. The influence of these writers extended far beyond the frontiers of France, over

<sup>1</sup> The letter is to be found in *Œuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, xv. 122. Berlin, 1854.

other countries; and we in England especially have been in the habit of repeating their language.

In Germany, Frederick himself is the model and prototype of that description of history which is known in our days as the school of Gotha, and for a long time he was its only representative. There was no historical literature in Germany before the close of the eighteenth century. Until the poetic and elegant literature had gone before, the language did not possess the flexibility and softness necessary for a narrative in artistic prose. The historical works of that period are mostly shapeless compilations, useful only for reference, or mere rhetorical exercises, like the historical works of Schiller. Political history began to be written for a purpose by German professors only after 1815, when the Prussian state had gone through many further vicissitudes. After Frederick had set up his monarchy with the aid of France, in defiance of the imperial house, hatred and armaments against Austria were necessarily the system of the new state. His father had kept up a large army because his soul knew no greater enjoyment than the duties of a drill-sergeant. Frederick perfected the military state into a weapon of offence against Austria. Frederick William had made two-and-a-half millions of inhabitants pay and feed 87,000 profitless idlers. Frederick II. doubled the dominions and the subjects of his father, and compelled his five millions to keep up in time of peace an army of 180,000 men. The military burdens of Prussia at the present day are scarcely one third of what they were under Frederick II.; and the complaints and murmurs of the Prussians now must give us a standard of the measure by which their forefathers estimated the glory of their king. In those days no complaints were heard. Frederick did not wish to have an army of idlers. He required that they should work in the remunerative field of war. When his finances were in sufficient order, he overran the dominion of some neighbour, generally of Maria Theresa. This was repeated four times. On the two first occasions he was in open alliance with France. He began his third war in the firm belief that France would not act contrary to her traditional policy, and would never join Austria against him. Kaunitz was more cunning than he, and concluded the treaty of 1757 with France against the King, who was already in Saxony. This alliance displayed from first to last an incurable weakness, and thus enabled the concentrated force, the military genius, and the single will of Frederick to carry him through the war. A fourth time, in 1778, he broke out, expecting to be supported either



by Russia or by France; but he was deceived, and brought down on Germany the disgrace of a peace of which Catherine II. dictated the terms and guaranteed the maintenance.

Frederick's designs were exclusively warlike; he urged and pressed his miserable subjects till they set on foot one soldier for every twenty-seven inhabitants. Yet he was pursued every where by a sense of weakness. His five millions of subjects were little in comparison with the great monarchies that surrounded him. From France he had, indeed, nothing to fear. The growth of a state like Prussia corresponded too well to her national policy of antagonism against Austria. France was not likely to desert him, but he had closed the door against an alliance with her. Twice, in 1740 and 1744, he had invited her to a league, and each time he had broken it when he thought he could break it with advantage. Henceforth that means of support was at an end. But he feared and hated Austria, and required an ally against her. The other German States held aloof, for they had reason to fear him more than they had ever feared Austria in times past. He sought the aid of Russia. Catherine was ready to consent to it, and Frederick paid her an annual tribute of half a million florins. The alliance was sealed by participation in a common crime. Frederick proposed the dismemberment of the tottering and distracted kingdom of Poland; and Catherine showed herself ready to execute it, and to distribute the spoil so as to give much to the stronger and less to the weaker. Austria opposed the criminal project; but the allies threatened to combine their forces against her, and Maria Theresa reluctantly consented to an act which her minister represented as inevitable.

The partition of Poland, and the services of Frederick in promoting the marriage of the Grand Duke Paul, preserved the alliance for a time. Then Catherine preferred the new Emperor Joseph, and abandoned the King of Prussia. He had never been regarded as an equal partner in the alliance, and was only tolerated till a better could be found. He could not conclude treaties himself, but was obliged to apply and to wait for his admission. It was the unavoidable fate of a power hardly even of the second rank, in attempting to stand on a level with the great monarchies. It cannot be said that the proud and ambitious king did not feel the humiliation to which he was exposed. More than once his passion ran over, and he gave vent to his hatred of Catherine before his brother Henry, whom he did not love. He weighed painfully the necessity of an alliance for his new state. The necessity existed, but it existed only in consequence of Frederick's own

indefensible policy. He had torn asunder the natural bond of union with the German empire and with Austria. All the misery and bloodshed that the Germans suffered in the half-century of his reign came from him. Like the links of a long chain, it proceeded from his invasion of Silesia; and the consequences were not over at his death. He left behind him, as the fruit of his labours, the Prussian state, which he had constructed and maintained by treachery and falsehood, but also with genius and energy. It is an old and true saying of a great historian, that states are preserved by the same means by which they are founded. Frederick had, moreover, in the course of his long reign, impressed on the state he had created the strong and enduring lust of conquest. But he could leave behind him only the craving, which might or might not be subdued. The genius and the energy with which he had satisfied it in his life he took with him to his grave.

The consequence was, that the policy of Prussia for twenty years after the death of Frederick II. was the most miserable ever seen in the world. Every where there was a childish appetite, and nowhere resolution and activity to gratify it. The Emperor Leopold II. with difficulty curbed the boyish eagerness of Frederick William II. to begin a war against the Revolution; for Leopold was statesman enough to understand that nothing could be more welcome to the revolutionary leaders than war. Mindful of the conservative traditions of his house, he formed a league with Frederick William, in March 1792, for the maintenance of the existing order in Germany and in Poland. Soon after, rumours of war against Austria came from Paris. A Prussian envoy appeared at Vienna in April, asking permission to annex the towns of Thorn and Danzig, in return for which Prussia undertook to observe the treaty she had just ratified. The astonished Austrians dismissed the envoy with a refusal. But the Prussian government was in earnest in this demand. A few days after, the same envoy was on his way to St. Petersburg with the same proposal; and there he obtained what he asked for, and more besides. "Thorn and Danzig," said the Empress, "were too little. Prussia ought to have more, and ought to raise its demands." This was the beginning of the second partition of Poland.

It has been often and justly said, that the coincidence of the French Revolution with the maturity of the schemes of Catherine II. against Poland was fatal to Europe. But there was at the same time a third element in the combination,—the weakness, the cupidity, and the degradation of the Prussian government,—which prepared the way for the others, and



gave them importance. The alliance which Leopold formed in March 1792 made head both against the East and the West. The demands of Prussia, four weeks later, deprived the alliance of its value. Catherine treated the expression of that wish as an invitation to divide Poland. This was not the intention of the Prussian government; but its selfish ambition gave Russia an opportunity of urging it farther than it would have otherwise gone. For it was the interest of Prussia to preserve Poland and not to destroy it, and this had been the declared policy of Frederick II.

Just as the ambition of Prussia opened the way for France in the West, as it had done before for Russia in the North, the French declared war against Austria, in the belief that Prussia would join in it, or at least be neutral. They trusted to the dependence of Prussia on their support in order to satisfy her ruling passion for growth. More than once the revolutionary leaders offered the hegemony of Germany as the price of the Prussian alliance. This project, which is now pursued by the Nationalverein, was originally conceived by the republicans of 1793. In return, they demanded that Prussia should unite her forces with theirs in an attack upon Austria. Frederick William II. shrank from such an act of treason; but the French had at least succeeded in cramping the resistance of Germany. The Prussian officers ostentatiously displayed their preference for their enemies and their aversion for their Austrian allies, and the Austrians were filled with a natural suspicion and alarm. This is the reason of the failure of the allies in the first period of the revolutionary war, in spite of their great superiority. The bravery of the republican armies obtained the victory, in consequence of the depressing and dividing influence which the policy of Prussia exerted over the operations of the German armies.

Frederick William had been eager for the war; but for his ministers the only question, while it lasted, was to obtain from the French an adequate price for the retirement of Prussia from the coalition. Negotiations were actively carried on in the autumn of 1794. France made both claims and offers; but what it claimed for itself, and what it offered in compensation, was always German territory, to which it had no right. France demanded the frontier of the Rhine, and offered to Prussia, which at that time possessed but very little west of the Rhine, a considerable extent of territory on the right bank. In return for this, Prussia withdrew from the coalition. She went farther, and undertook to reduce and occupy, by force of arms, any states of Northern Germany that might refuse to consent to the peace, and might remain

true to their duty to the Emperor and the German empire. That peace of Basil, of the year 1795, breathes treason to Germany in every line. It was, in fact, nothing but the first treaty for the partition of Germany between France and Prussia. It was the realisation of those words of Frederick II. to the French ambassador, as he rode out of Berlin to his first battle: "Je vais, je crois, jouer votre jeu. Si les as me viennent, nous partagerons."

The policy of the Peace of Basil caused the successes of France and the calamities of Germany in the following years. Not only the dominions of the Prussian crown, but the other territories of Northern Germany, were reduced to inaction by the threatening attitude of the government of Berlin. Austria alone, assisted by Southern Germany, carried on the contest with the French Republic, with equal success at first, until the genius of Bonaparte turned the scale. The naval victories of England gave no aid to the allies on land. The Peace of Campo Formio was followed by that of Luneville, in which the ecclesiastical states were divided at the choice of the First Consul, and Prussia obtained her share. In 1805 a new coalition was formed, and again it depended on Prussia, by her coöperation in the common cause to arrest the enormous power of the French Emperor. But the government felt before all things the desire of extension at any price, and hoped to earn a good reward by its neutrality. Both the contending powers showed their contempt for this cowardly policy. The Russians and the French traversed at the same time portions of the Prussian territory. The Prussian government was indignant, and sent Count Haugwitz, the type of the empty, self-sufficient class of statesmen who ruled at Berlin, to demand explanations of Napoleon. The Emperor made him wait till Austerlitz was won, and then determined not to make Prussia his enemy at once, but to keep in his own hands the choice of the time for the coming breach. He knew that he could always have Prussia in his power, by exciting her cupidity with a prospect of new territories. He offered Hanover, which he had occupied because it belonged to his enemy King George, but which had no part in the war between England and France. The invasion of Hanover was therefore directly contrary to the law of nations; but this did not alarm the Prussians. They eagerly swallowed the bait, and sent troops into Hanover, without perceiving that it had been offered to them only in order to be taken away, that France might have an opportunity at command of forcing them into a quarrel.

Napoleon did not follow the tradition of the national policy of France, which was to spare Prussia and to support



her as a useful and sure ally against Austria. The position was no longer the same. Austria was crushed, and the alliance of Prussia was no longer needed against her. The envy and the selfish indifference of Prussia had done its part. Her own time for destruction had arrived. In the summer of 1806 Napoleon thought the harvest was ripe. A few months before, he had made over Hanover to Prussia, and then opened negotiations with England, in which he allowed it to appear that he would not be unwilling to restore the Electorate to George III. This was reported to Berlin, where it was received with indignation, and the army was placed at once on a war-footing. Nothing could be more welcome to Napoleon, who overthrew the Prussian monarchy with a single blow. It fell unmourned and unpitied; and only the intercession of the Emperor Alexander at Tilsit obtained for Frederick William the restoration of part of his dominions.

For seven years there was no Germany. The princes of the Confederation were vassals of France, and gave their subjects to fight Napoleon's battles against Austria, Spain, and Russia. They were rewarded with an entire and absolute sovereignty over the people. All the self-governing corporations, which had lasted till the downfall of the empire, were now abolished, and a general equality of servitude followed. Those princes have been severely judged, especially by the party which sees in Prussia the end of all its hopes for Germany. And yet Prussia alone was answerable for this degradation, and alone had given that example of perfidy and treason to the common country which led to its ruin. All that made the Confederation of the Rhine so humiliating to Germany proceeded as a necessary consequence from the Peace of Basil, or rather from that inauspicious day in 1740 on which Frederick II. gave his troops orders to enter Silesia. Austria fought once more for the independence of Europe, in 1809; and again Napoleon conquered, until he reached the term of his success at Moscow, and lost his army in the retreat.

A better time opened with the spring of 1813. But it did not come by the act of the Prussian government, but by the rising of the Germans against the French supremacy that oppressed and irritated them. The movement began in East Prussia, where it was supported by the presence of the Russians. Thence it ran through Germany. But the government obeyed it with reluctance, and Field-Marshal Yorck was never pardoned for his convention with the Russian commanders. Frederick William III. was compelled to swim with the current which it was impossible to stem. The Germans conquered, and the Congress of Vienna assembled.

In that victorious period the Prussian people outstripped

their government, and joined with the whole nation. Even among the patriotic poets of the War of Deliverance there were Prussian subjects, like Schenkendorf, who longed for the restoration of the fallen empire. Yet the great German movement could not fail to play into the hands of the Prussian government, which was again eager for increase of power, and claimed a recompense for the lead it had taken in the war. Austria was obliged to consent to the dismemberment of Saxony, and one-half of the Saxons were made over to Prussia. The dualism of Germany was established on a broad and firm basis; and the monarchy of Frederick the Great was more than doubled, and became one of the members of the European Pentarchy. But, in comparison with the others, it was not a power of the first order, and the pressure of its littleness was not removed. Its population is only half that of any of the other great powers, and it has no compensation in the position or the form of its dominions. They are shapeless and divided, and the soil is not highly productive. The army necessary to maintain the artificial rank and influence of the state is beyond the resources of the inhabitants, and yet it is so organised as to be efficient only for defence. Prussia cannot carry on a foreign war, and has not the means of constructing a fleet. She has no historic unity—no consciousness of having been united for centuries. The Protestantism of the state is broken down by seven millions of Catholic inhabitants. Prussia has been made a great power in name, with all the traditions of an inferior power. There is no national policy impressed by history upon the country. It has no other but that which its position imposes—the policy of increase at any price.

For thirty years after 1815 Prussia followed in the wake of Austria. The German empire was not revived; the Confederation took its place; and Austria obtained, as a relic of her old supremacy, the right of presiding at the Diet. The sovereign princes who composed it followed naturally the impulse of the preponderant state, and imitated Prussia in their submission to the Austrian government. Ambition and the lust of conquest seemed to slumber. But it was only a superficial calm. There was agitation beneath the surface. During this period historical studies were actively pursued; but history was chiefly in the hands of the professors, and this determined its tendency and spirit. Austria was shut up in herself, as she was tempted to be by her own mass, and as she had been even when the empire had more intimately connected her with the rest of Germany. The difference of religion stood like a barrier between her and the professors at the Universities of Germany. It repelled them from Austria, and



attracted them towards Prussia. A whole class of influential and able men, whose writings moulded the opinion of the age, was estranged from one power, and driven to support the other. Prussia knew how to take the fullest advantage of this state of things. She cherished and cultivated the professors. An appointment at the University of Berlin was made the supreme reward of merit, and the highest aim of a professor's ambition. The prospect of such promotion exercises a singular fascination on the minds of men to whom it presents itself. It was an irresistible influence, which arose and was established without any definite endeavour to corrupt the professors, or any conscious loss of independence on their part. In the great majority of German histories published of late years, the Prussian point of view predominates over the German. Even the historians of the smaller states contribute to the same result. Except Austria and Bavaria, there is no mainly Catholic state in Germany. Besides Saxony, all the other reigning houses are Protestant. In each of these states, therefore, the official acceptable view of history is Protestant; and the writers have seldom any encouragement to overcome the ordinary prejudices, or give up the specifically Protestant standard of judgment. This is not so much a reproach as an important fact, because it is one which the Prussian government is able to turn to account.

The nature of this danger may be explained by an instance. We have mentioned the letter from the Pope to Marshal Daun, which Frederick II. forged in order to excite the fanaticism of his people against the Catholic enemy. In the year 1845 this letter fell into the hands of the Lutheran prelate Dr. Zimmermann, the head of the Protestant Church in Hesse Darmstadt, a man animated with a sincere zeal for his religion, and with a corresponding zeal against the Papacy. The ardour of these sentiments put his critical faculties to sleep. He published the letter in his *Ecclesiastical Journal*, and introduced it as authentic to his clergy, who could not be expected to show the discrimination which their superior wanted. Frederick would have been made happy if he could have foreseen that, after the lapse of a century, he would have such a disciple. The same Dr. Zimmermann displayed a similar knowledge of history on another occasion. He founded a society for the support of Protestants destitute of the means of religious worship. Nothing could be more proper than to supply Protestant communities with a church or a school; but this society was called the Association of Gustavus Adolphus (*Gustav-Adolfsverein*). The name alone did more than a hundred books to promote the popular belief which the Swedes imposed on Germany two centuries ago with their

mercenaries and cannon, that the ambitious conqueror Gustavus Adolphus was a religious champion, the giver and saviour of freedom of conscience. Further, the name is connected with a tendency to aggression and hatred against Austria. The importance of this influence may be understood, if it is remembered that the Association is spread all over Germany, and counts members in every village. In Prussia this was fully appreciated; and the King did not hesitate to accept the protectorate of the Association, as soon as it had grown into importance, though Gustavus Adolphus hardly ever insulted and injured any other prince so grossly as his relative the Elector of Brandenburg, who joined the Swedes only by compulsion, when their cannon were pointed at the windows of his palace, and who, as soon as he was out of their power, turned against them, and threw himself into the Imperialist party.

The real Gotha party, however, has its seat and basis among the German professors, who have accepted the mission of glorifying the acts of Frederick II., and who revive the tendencies of his unmitigated despotism in conjunction with a vulgar liberalism. Their object is to make Prussia a real great power, or to erect a Prussian empire over Germany, with a parliamentary government. They look to England as the model to be imitated; and herein lies the great historical and political error of the party, which resembles that of the French liberals in 1790. Before the Thirty Years' war, the power of the estates within any German territory was at least equal to that of the English Parliament under Elizabeth or James. It was as late as the year 1627 that the estates of Brandenburg refused supplies for an army of 900 men. Twenty years later they no longer had the power to do this. The Thirty Years' war, and its consequences, broke the power of the free institutions. The creation of a standing army opened in each territory the way to absolutism.

In no state was that absolutism carried out so thoroughly and so relentlessly as in Prussia which in the eighteenth century was the most perfect despotism. Frederick II. destroyed all those institutions and authorities conservative of freedom, on which a parliamentary constitution could have arisen; and he left to his posterity and to his people the tradition and belief that in Prussia the king governs, and the king alone. The Gotha party imagine that the self-governing bodies can be replaced by elections according to majorities, or some new scheme of government unknown to the traditions, and not founded on the materials, which the country has preserved. The parliamentary system cannot find a soil in Prussia in which to strike root. In case of conflict between



the crown and the parliament, the electors will not stand by their representative. They have neither the inclination nor the means to support him. The military power is exclusively in the hands of the executive. If we remember how hard was the struggle between the Long Parliament and the King, although the Parliament was in possession of the machinery of administration, it is evident that the crown must prevail in any similar conflict with the Prussian parliament, which has not the material foundation of independence, and would be disabled by the stopping of the supplies which each member receives from the state.

It is certain, however, that this proclamation of the ideas of parliamentary government which now prevail in Europe contributes in an eminent degree to the strength of the Gotha party. It was first adopted in the Frankfort parliament; and its conspicuous failure there, and the political incapacity of the leaders of the party, did not open men's eyes. The constitution was finished, and the imperial crown was offered to the King of Prussia. He refused it; but all the members of his family did not share his views. Frederick William IV. considered that in rejecting the offer he was making up for the weakness he had displayed before the revolution at Berlin on the 18th of March 1848. He never really adopted the views of the party to which he owed the prospect of an imperial crown. When the deputation which carried the vote of the parliament to Berlin had so completely failed in its mission, the Frankfort assembly came rapidly to a close. The bulk of the party who had voted for the Prussian empire met together at Gotha, and hence they received their name.

They had been repulsed, but they continued actively to pursue their end. The Prussian government did not quite abandon them; for, with the uncertainty and want of straightforwardness that always characterised its policy, it still desired to employ, for its own advantage, the services of the party whose object it had frustrated. A proposal was made to institute a union of several German powers, with Prussia at their head, with a view of gradually absorbing them. A new parliament met for the purpose at Erfurt, but achieved nothing. Prussia again made a beginning, and attempted to defy Austria in the Hessian question. The armies stood opposite each other; but Prussia took alarm, did penance at Olmütz, and demanded the restoration of the Diet. Austria acted generously; for it lay perhaps in her power at that time to put an end for ever to the Prussian schemes of aggrandisement. The Prussian minister, Baron Manteuffel, uttered the famous words, "the strong recedes."

The excited passions settled down, but the action of the

party was on the increase. Austria persisted in her old fault of neglecting the scientific and popular literature of the rest of Germany, while professors wrote great works in which, in the name of historical research, they made a propaganda for what was called the mission of Prussia. This mission they believe to consist in the absorption of all the rest of Germany. One of the leaders of the party thus defines its scope: "Prussia embraces only fragments of the German land and people. But the essence and end of the state lies in its mission to the whole nation, of which it has gradually annexed successive parts. In this mission lie its justification and its strength. Prussia would cease to be necessary if she could forget it. Whenever she has forgotten it for a time, she has been weak, declining, and near destruction."<sup>2</sup> The writer of this passage has undertaken the history of the Prussian policy. But this policy of annexation only began with the attack on Silesia in 1740. Herr Droysen has therefore endeavoured to show that the same fundamental character is found in the policy of the Hohenzollerns ever since they obtained their first elevation, in consequence of their fidelity to the empire. It was a difficult enterprise; but the author has made it easier by putting into his pages all that Swedish or French historians, or the partisans of the several smaller princes, have ever said to the prejudice of Austria. For the Gotha party have entered upon the inheritance of all the accusations, just or imaginary, which have at any time been made against her. This work was begun at the Saxon University of Jena. Some years after, the author was summoned to Berlin, which purchases, by means of such disinterested appointments, the title of the intellectual metropolis of Germany.

Many other writers are actively engaged in a similar effort to give a basis in historical science to the ambitious policy of Prussia. The most conspicuous of all is Professor Sybel, who has lately attempted to use all the history of Germany since Charlemagne as an instrument of the Gotha opposition to Austria. He roused many opponents among Protestant writers, such as Klopp and Wydenbrugg, and he was answered with the authority of Leibniz, who expressed himself in the year 1690 as follows: "I deem it but just to attribute it to Austria that Germany still stands, and that the imperial name has not yet fallen." But, however powerful or impartial the refutations, there can be no doubt that the mass of the Northern Germans generally incline, if not to the practical tendencies of the Gotha party, at least to its views of history. The first cause of this is the negligence and apathy of Austria. She has done nothing with any vigour to rectify the pretended

<sup>2</sup> Droysen, *Geschichte der Preussischen Politik*, i. 3.



results of historical investigation, or to assert her own claims and support her own cause.

In this contest, the position of the smaller states is peculiar. Since Prussia has concentrated in her own hands all the animosity and antagonism against Austria that has ever been shown by any of the German princes, a natural, though silent and unacknowledged, league subsists between Austria and the middle states. They have nothing to fear from Austria, for she has shown no inclination to annex any German territories. They all fear Prussia, and rely on the Austrians alone for protection against her ambition. If Austria falls, they fall with her, that is, they must be swallowed up by Prussia. It would follow from this obvious fact, that the middle powers are interested in giving no encouragement to the tendencies of the Gotha party. Yet the contrary to this occurred till lately. Leaders of that party, the historians Sybel, Droysen, and Häusser, were professors at Munich, Jena, and Heidelberg. There they taught their doctrine of the necessity of enlarging Prussia, and of her duty and vocation to incorporate the other German states. So general was the belief that the Gotha party represented the real science of history, that its views have become almost universally prevalent in literature, and filter through the universities into the schools. Three-fourths of the periodical press is in its hands. In other countries, and especially in England, nothing is known of historical literature in Germany except through the medium of this school.

In 1859, a generous movement traversed the middle states in favour of Austria; and, if the governments had had their own way, the Germans would have risen in such force that they might have reduced the power of Napoleon III., and relieved Europe of the overwhelming pressure of perpetual armaments. But the Emperor Napoleon justly reckoned on the neutrality and indecision of Prussia; and when the movement became threatening, it was avoided by a hasty peace. The agitators used this position of affairs with great dexterity. The necessity of a closer union of Germany had never been felt so keenly as in that summer. The desire for a more concentrated system was universal. This idea was adopted by the men of the school, who went on to declare that it was necessary that a German power should take the lead, — a power which could only be Prussia, because Austria was disabled by the effect of her losses. They therefore very wisely demanded, not that the several princes should surrender their independence, but that the military power and the diplomatic action should be intrusted to Prussia. By this artifice, the full consequences of which were not seen at

once, they succeeded in winning many well-meaning persons. The result was the *Nationalverein*, one of the most melancholy products of the national history. It arose out of the partial and one-sided notion of German history which the Gotha party has been propagating for so many years. The idea was originally French, and was a just calculation of the Jacobins, that it was to their advantage that their neighbours should exhaust themselves in contending with each other. That purpose would be attained by the success of the *Nationalverein*. It is of course needless to argue with men who believe that they would not be made Prussian subjects if the military and diplomatic lead were given to Prussia. A union of this kind would be safer with Austria than with Prussia, because Austria is essentially not aggressive, and never attempted to centralise Germany under Vienna. But Prussia is in origin and nature centralising and expanding, and would inevitably use the conceded power to absorb the conceding states. The governments and a portion of the people know this well. In the southern states, in Wirtemberg, and, above all, in Bavaria, there is a strong antipathy to Prussia, and the plans of the national party can never succeed by peaceful means. Their execution threatens to bring down on Germany the worst horrors of civil war.

A secondary element in the *Nationalverein* is composed of those democrats who desire a concentration of Germany under Prussia, because it is more easy to attain their ultimate object where there is a single head than where there are many, and the Prussian empire would be the preliminary to the republic. The Prussian government has treated the whole movement with its usual duplicity. It disavowed the association in public, and encouraged it secretly. In the affairs of the Diet, it promoted the views of the party, and proceeded against the Diet, as Frederick had treated the empire, in such a way as to dissolve and subvert its authority. It was restored at the desire of Prussia in 1850, and had prepared a series of general laws for the whole country respecting a uniform standard of weights and measures, a civil code, and other things. The Prussian government opposed all these measures. If a Prussian supremacy is ever established, the Diet must first of all be destroyed; and to prepare the way for this, its moral authority must be undermined. To this end the organs of Prussia and Gotha are constantly abusing the Diet, and declaring that it is useless and incompetent to do any good.

During the last few months Prussia has exhibited her plans more openly. Towards the close of last year, the celebrated historian Professor Sybel published an historical pamphlet, in which he laboured to show that the whole history of Germany



tends towards the establishment of an inner confederation under the supremacy of Prussia, and a more extensive league which should include Austria. It was the programme of the Nationalverein on the scientific foundation of the Gotha party. From the great ability and literary fame of the writer, the book created some sensation, though it was supposed to be merely the lucubration of a private individual. About the same time the Saxon minister, Herr von Beust, presented to the governments a scheme of Federal Reform. Count Bernstorff answered that the only possible reform was the creation of a federal union under Prussia, and a further league between it and Austria. It was the substance of the national project in a slightly modified form; but the Prussian statesman went farther, and deduced the Prussian title to the supremacy from the clauses of the act of confederation, a document which speaks only of equal sovereign governments. This was too bold a refinement; and the governments of Austria and the lesser kingdoms immediately replied by identical notes to Prussia, in which they proved the contrary of Count Bernstorff's argument, from the text of the act to which he appealed. They pressed for a reform of the confederation, but on the basis of existing rights.

It is evident that Prussia can never attain her object by peaceful means. This is the contradiction under which she labours. She would be glad to pursue a course of conquest in imitation of Frederick II.; and at the same time, conscious of her weakness in comparison with the rest of Germany, she is anxious to obtain a possibility of peaceful annexation. Courage is wanting to her ambition. With most of the members of the National Association it is otherwise. The majority of these men wish to see Prussia occupying in Germany as soon as possible the position of Piedmont in Italy. Professor Sybel demands that Prussia should take steps to constitute a united Germany—first, by diplomatic negotiations with Austria, and, if they fail, by having recourse to arms. The writers of his school have taken care that political wrong shall no longer appear to be wrong. It is the fruit of their teaching, that the measure of political morality is sought exclusively in the result. This is the criterion which justifies that attack on Austria by Frederick the Great which is the origin of the modern Prussian state. Consequently, the same success would justify a similar act at the present time. The moral confusion of ideas in the public mind of Germany respecting Italian affairs is due to this cause. In this country the indulgence shown to the Piedmontese policy has much to do with a stupid liberalism and bigotry, but it is also founded partly on real grounds of na-

tional interest. Many Englishmen sincerely believe that a free and united Italy would be an ally against France; and, however untenable such an opinion may be, it contains an element of patriotism, and even of reason. But the Germans have no excuse for blindness in the matter. They have either no interest at all involved in the Italian movement, or, if they have any, their sympathies should naturally be on the side of the German power against whom that movement is directed. But the whole influence of the school of Gotha and of the national party is adverse to Austria, and their patriotism is exhibited in a persistent hostility to the interests of the first of the German powers.

Should Prussia ever determine to adopt the traditional policy of Frederick II., there would be no lack of adventurers ready to obey her call, but certainly a great want of wisdom and judgment in action. It would be proved once more that Frederick the Great bequeathed to his state the impulse to increase, but was unable to leave behind him the will and the genius by which his own successes were obtained. This disparity between the end and the means is the disease of the Prussian monarchy. Prussia is neither great nor small. She feels her impotence, and wishes to be powerful; but she possesses only the desire, not the strength to accomplish it. This desire, which has constantly and restlessly shown itself on every occasion during many years, and has always been repulsed, is a warning to Austria and the other German states to be upon their guard. The inclination has never been so powerful as now; and many circumstances in the condition of Austria and the rest of Germany have contributed to make the majority of the Prussian people, and a large portion of the Germans of the north, its partisans. The ideas of Frederick the Great have become a sort of common property. But there is an utter want of capacity to realise them, and that want is not supplied by lofty words. Prussia cannot carry out the wishes of the Gotha party and the Nationalverein without bringing greater misery on Germany than Victor Emmanuel has brought on Italy, because there will be the resistance of well-organised states and of an attached and loyal population to overcome—a resistance strengthened moreover by religious antagonism. The attempt is one which Prussia cannot make without the security that Piedmont enjoyed in the support of France; while, under any circumstances, the state of Germany is less favourable to her schemes of ambition than it was in the year 1740, and the issue of an attempt on her part might easily be very different from the expectations with which it would be made.



TROLLOPE'S NORTH AMERICA.<sup>1</sup>

It ought to be, one would think, a fair earnest of a good book, that the ambition of the author's literary life has been to write it. And yet we read this announcement at the opening of Mr. Trollope's work with some misgivings. Perhaps, had he waited to frame his wishes until after he had seen the country he was to describe, the case would have been different; but where a man sets out on his travels with a preconceived determination to enshrine them in a fitting record, there is at least a possibility that in his choice of materials for his book he will be governed by the consideration rather of what ought to be in it than of what he is able to put there. A book of travel will be good just in proportion as its writer gives himself to the description of that which he is most competent to describe. We do not mean that Mr. Trollope has been writing of subjects of which he knows nothing. Few men are less likely to commit themselves after this fashion. On the contrary, we are quite ready to accept what he has given us at his own valuation. He tells his readers that a book on the government of the United States would "do honour to the life-long studies" of some great "constitutional pundit," but that "the plain words of a man who is no pundit need not disgrace the subject," if he can write truly what he thinks honestly,—that the death of Hector is a fit subject for a schoolboy's verses, though Homer also sang of it. If the ground were wholly unbroken, there might be some truth in this view. But as it is, the only result of Mr. Trollope's labours is to tell us, pleasantly enough, though with no small amount of verbosity, what almost every one who is not certain to skip the constitutional chapters of his book will have seen in some form before. Of course, if we could feel assured that we have lost nothing by the course Mr. Trollope has pursued, we should not be disposed to quarrel with him merely because he has inserted chapters on the government, the law, and the finance of the United States in the body of the work, and added the inevitable Declaration of Independence in an appendix. It would, at any rate, have been no worse offence than the interpolation of a dissertation on promotion in the Civil Service into the novel of *The Three Clerks*. But it is difficult to believe that the book has not suffered by the prominence given to questions which do

<sup>1</sup> North America. By Anthony Trollope. 2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall.

not fall within the author's peculiar province. Mr. Trollope seems to us to be fitted in no common degree to describe social phenomena. Character and manners he paints with a touch which, if it is superficial, is still singularly accurate; and it seems rather like cutting blocks with a razor when he devotes time and space to telling us that all the States in the Union return an equal number of senators, or that judges chosen by universal suffrage are not likely to be independent of the populace. We could have made the acquaintance of these and such-like facts for ourselves, without the intervention of Mr. Trollope as master of the ceremonies. It is highly desirable that every traveller in America should know something—the more the better—of the political features of the country before he sets out. But it is not necessary that he should insist upon making all his readers as wise as himself. There is plenty of evidence that Mr. Trollope did make this preparation most conscientiously; only we should have been better pleased if he had not insisted upon incorporating the scaffolding with the artist's design. It is quite possible to have too little of the personal element in a book of travels; and we cannot help thinking that if Mr. Trollope had thrown his notes into a somewhat less elaborate form, he would have given his readers more pleasure and as much profit. It would have been quite impossible, we are well aware, to have travelled in America in 1861-2, and not to have given a large space in the narrative to the political questions of the day; but the proper function of the traveller is description rather than dissertation, and, at any rate, the latter element should be only admitted when his residence in the country has enabled him to get possession of facts which are not known to his readers at home. The latter half of this condition is, we dare say, fulfilled in the present instance; but we cannot help thinking that the greater part of the writer's constitutional lore might as well have been got up in England as in the United States.

Perhaps the most interesting parts of Mr. Trollope's book are the chapters in which he brings out the striking differences which exist, whether in interests, feelings, or probable future, between the Northern and Western States. The eight states which lie wholly west of the Alleghanies—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Kansas—contain a free population greater than the total population of the ten Southern States. If the Border States are saved for the Union, Missouri, Kentucky, and Western Virginia must be reckoned with the West; and in that case the population will be about equal to that of the Northern



States proper,—equal, that is, at the present moment, but increasing at a very much faster rate. That these Border States will remain within the Union seems decidedly the most probable result, if the dispute is terminated by European mediation. The South cannot reconquer them; and, divided as their interests and feelings necessarily are between the contending confederacies, the balance appears to incline towards the North. In Missouri the slaves are only a tenth of the population; and out of the 170,000 inhabitants of St. Louis, only 2000 are slaves. Here, therefore, there is evidently but little vitality in the system, and, left to itself, slavery will probably soon die out of the State. In Kentucky their numbers are much greater,—about twenty per cent of the population; but here the restraints imposed by public opinion upon their owners must seriously impair their commercial value. They are not convertible. In Kentucky men do not sell their slaves; but their creditors sometimes do it for them, and hence it has come to be almost a sign of bankruptcy. If they have more slaves than they know what to do with, they let them out to hire; if they have fewer than they want, they hire them from some one else. A quasi-patriarchal system of this kind has little in common with the huge plantations and wholesale slave-markets of the South. The slave-owning interest will not carry the Border States towards the South; and the powerful Southern sympathies exhibited even by the people of Maryland are evidently founded, not on commercial views, but on the political habits and instincts which are developed in all slave-states, in contrast with the absolute equality of Northern democracy.

The divergence of interests between the Western and Northern States is daily becoming more marked. The North is a manufacturing country; and, as its efforts in that direction are still very feeble, the manufacturers insist strongly on the necessity of protection from foreign competition. The West is as eager for free-trade as the South itself. Indeed, in this respect their interests are one and the same. They are both devoted to production,—of grain in the one case, and cotton in the other,—and both desirous of exporting their produce, and receiving foreign manufactures in return. The growth of the export trade of the West is the most extraordinary feature of the recent progress of the United States. The prairies of Illinois and Minnesota are still only in the very infancy of cultivation, and the railway which crosses the State of Michigan runs for the greater part of the distance through an uncleared forest; and yet in 1861, 60,000,000 bushels of grain and flour passed through Buffalo, at the

lower end of Lake Erie, the point at which trans-shipment into canal-boats or railway-cars takes place. These figures do not include the grain shipped in sea-going vessels which pass through the Welland Canal into Lake Ontario, and out by the St. Lawrence.

"I confess that, to my own mind," says Mr. Trollope,—and we suspect most of our readers will in this point agree with him,—“statistical amounts do not bring home any enduring idea. Fifty million bushels of corn and flour simply seems to mean a great deal. It is a powerful form of superlative, and soon vanishes away, as do other superlatives in this age of strong words. I was at Chicago and at Buffalo in October 1861. I went down to the granaries, and climbed up into the elevators. I saw the wheat running in rivers from one vessel into another, and from the railroad up into the huge bins on the top stores of the warehouses. I saw corn measured by the forty-bushel measure with as much ease as we measure an ounce of cheese, and with greater rapidity. I ascertained that the work went on weekday and Sunday, day and night incessantly; rivers of wheat and rivers of maize ever running. I saw the men bathed in corn as they distributed it in its flow. I saw bins by the score laden with wheat, in each of which bins there was space for a comfortable residence. I breathed the flour, and drank the flour, and felt myself to be enveloped in an ocean of breadstuff; and then I believed, understood, and brought it home to myself as a fact, that here in the cornlands of Michigan, and amidst the bluffs of Wisconsin, and on the high table plains of Minnesota, and the prairies of Illinois, had God prepared the food for the increasing millions of the Eastern world, as also for the coming millions of the Western.”

It is easy to see, with such grain-crops as these, how important it becomes to the Western States to have a ready outlet to the markets, whether of the old or the new continent. Nature has given them the two greatest systems of inland water carriage in the world—the great lakes on the north-east, and the Mississippi on the south. Last autumn the Mississippi was closed, the railways were overworked, and the cost of carriage to the coast rose greatly in consequence. In October 1861 a bushel of Indian corn was sold by the farmer in Illinois for 5*d.*, while in Liverpool it fetched 3*s.* 10*d.*; and of this enormous increase, about 2*s.* was expended in the transit from Chicago to New York. Where the quality was inferior, it was not worth while to shell the corn for the market, and large quantities, which would only have been worth 4*d.* a bushel as food, were actually used for fuel. The loss which the closing of the Mississippi entails on the Western States is very great; and it is not difficult to understand how important it seems to them to regain the command of the navigation, and to keep it for the future in their own hands.



From St. Paul's, the capital of Minnesota, wheat can be carried to the Gulf of Mexico without change of boat, a distance of 1000 miles in a straight line; and St. Louis, which lies below the confluence of the Missouri and the Illinois with the Mississippi, boasts that it can command 46,000 miles of navigable water. Thus the secession of the South affects the material interests of the Western States far more directly than those of New England or New York; and it is only reasonable that they should claim to have a proportionate voice in the conduct, and hereafter in the termination, of the war.

But the command of the Mississippi is not the only point on which the attitude of the two great sections of the Northern Republic towards the seceders is marked by different characteristics. The hostility of the North is mainly political; the hostility of the West is mainly material and philosophical. The North regards the South not only as a rebel, but a rebel who has thrown off the yoke before it was well upon his neck. For many years past the Southern States have been the absolute rulers of the Union. They have furnished the North with statesmen and presidents, they have guided the whole policy of the Government; and now, just when the tables seemed on the point of being turned, when the North at last saw its way to making the South taste the sweets of submission, the South withdraws from the Union. The will of the majority has been the law of the Federation hitherto, when Northern politicians were in a minority; and the North is not disposed to see the law reversed because they happen for once to be in a majority. And therefore in the Northern States the Abolitionist party is still a small one. For the most part, if the Union could be preserved, and Southern policy be no longer in the ascendant, Northern politicians would be willing to give fresh guarantees to slavery, and even to some extent to enlarge its area. But the Western States hate slavery on economical grounds. They look upon the whole unsettled territory of the Union as the natural outlet for their coming population, and the appointed field for their labour; and they know that free-labour cannot coexist with slave-labour,—that wherever slavery sets its foot manual work becomes inevitably a symbol of degradation. This feeling is not, it is almost needless to say, allied with any love for the Negro—that is a weakness to which the most fanatical Abolitionist of Massachusetts rises superior; it is simply a dislike of the system as the natural and necessary antagonist of free-labour. Indeed, in many cases it would be hardly too much to say that the Western man gives

the first place in his dislike to the slave, and the second to the slave-holder, as the cause of the slave's being where he is. With this economical hostility to slavery, however, there is combined a philosophical one. A large and increasing section of the population of the Western States is composed of Germans. They form entire regiments in the Western army, while in Detroit and Milwaukee nearly every third shop bears a German name. And the Germans are to a man Abolitionists, not after the fashion of the Abolitionists of the North, where instant emancipation is regarded sometimes as an act of righteous vengeance on the rebels, sometimes as a means of calling into being an army of new allies; but after the fashion of German philosophers.

"A man, as a man, is entitled to freedom. That is their argument, and it is a very old one. When you ask them what they would propose to do with 4,000,000 of enfranchised slaves, and with their ruined masters,—how they would manage the affairs of those 12,000,000 of people, all whose wealth, and work, and very life, have hitherto been hinged and hung upon slavery;—they again ask you whether slavery is not in itself bad, and whether any thing acknowledged to be bad should be allowed to remain?"

It is much to be regretted that Mr. Trollope was not able to extend his journey into the Southern States. Apart from the great interest which any authentic and intelligent account of their condition would have for us just now, we should have much liked to have the results of his observations on the working of slavery. His West-Indian experience has not tended to make him think highly of schemes of hasty emancipation. It is no kindness to the slave to set him free until he is fit for freedom; and the true test of this fitness is in the recognition on his part of the necessity of labour. We have no objection to accept Mr. Trollope's test; but we must not forget that the expediency of retaining a system of slavery must be decided by the correlative test of its tendency to fit the slave for ultimately conforming to this requirement. It is here that the Southern case hopelessly breaks down. Let it be granted that the Negroes in the South are not conscious of the necessity of labour any more than the Negroes of the West Indies were conscious of it thirty years ago, what probability is there that they will ever become so under their present masters? Where population is dense, and the means of livelihood hard to get, the Negro will work like other men, as is proved by the experience of Barbadoes. But where subsistence lies ready to his hand, he—may we not here also say, like other men—will not work until his standard of comfort is raised and enlarged, and he finds that he must work if he wishes to realise it. But



there is no progress towards this end in slavery as it exists in the Southern States. It finds the Negro a barbarian—it leaves him at best a child, acting only by rule, without any conception of a law, and having no other idea of work than that of a schoolboy's task,—to be got over as quickly as possible.

“Charming pictures are drawn for you of the Negro in a state of Utopian bliss, owning his own hoe, and eating his own hog ; in a paradise where every thing is bought and sold, except his wife, his little ones, and himself. But the enfranchised Negro has always thrown away his hoe, has eaten any man's hog but his own, and has too often sold his daughter for a dollar, when any such market has been open to him.”

Doubtless such a result carries with it the condemnation of imprudent schemes of emancipation ; but it implies also the absolute and hopeless condemnation of the system which, after generations of entire and irresponsible possession, could leave such a result possible. We are disposed, however, to think that Mr. Trollope has not taken into account some elements of the Negro character which seem to give a better promise for the future. In the rare instances where Negroes have been trusted with a certain amount of independence, and allowed a share in the profits of their labour, they have shown themselves capable of improvement, and have sometimes made considerable sums by working after hours. As this is not done for subsistence, but to obtain luxuries, or in some cases to earn money to buy their freedom, it seems to follow that they are not wholly proof against the incentives by which white men are acted upon, and that some better possibility may be in store for the race than the gradual extinction to which Mr. Trollope looks forward as the best solution of the difficulty. He suggests an “edict enfranchising all female children born after a certain date, and all their children ;” the result of such an arrangement being that “the Negro population would probably die out slowly,—very slowly.” This proposal appears to us very far inferior to Mr. Olmsted's—to provide the slave as now with the necessities of food, lodging, and clothing, estimating them at their fair price, and allowing the overplus of his labour to accumulate for the purchase of his liberty. If he was too idle to work out the value of the necessities supplied to him, he might be coerced as at present. Practically, however, the question of emancipation is no longer one of personal interest to the North, except perhaps in the Border States, where it will prove comparatively easy. The South will have one day to deal with it for themselves ; and, difficult as the solution of the problem is already, it will only

become increasingly so in proportion as its expediency is denied and its possibility ignored.

And yet the position of the free labourer in these Western States is not altogether an enviable one. He is not poor, as we understand poverty in England; but his work is very hard, and his master very exacting. An American taskmaster "knows nothing of hours, and seems to have that idea of a man which a lady always has of a horse,—he thinks that he will go for ever." The independence of the American "help" does not extend itself to the labourer. He is accustomed to be driven. They will never "half move unless they're driven," a foreman said to Mr. Trollope; "they kinder look for it, and don't well know how to get along when they miss it." And then, although wages are high,—thirty shillings a week, perhaps, in towns, and half that sum, with board, in the country,—and food is cheaper than in England, yet clothing is dearer and more of it is required, and the wages are paid irregularly, and sometimes not at all. Not to pay your labourers does not seem to be specially discreditable in North America.

"We have men who go in debt to tradesmen, perhaps without a thought of paying them; but when we speak of such a one who has descended into the lowest mire of insolvency, we say that he has not paid his washerwoman. Out there in the West, the washerwoman is as fair game as the tailor, the domestic servant as the wine-merchant. If a man be honest, he will not willingly take either goods or labour without payment, and it may be hard to prove that he who takes the latter is more dishonest than he who takes the former; but with us there is a prejudice in favour of one's washerwoman, by which the Western mind is not weakened. 'They certainly have to be smart to get it,' a gentleman said to me whom I taxed on the subject. 'You see, on the frontier a man is bound to be smart. If he ain't smart, he'd better go back East, perhaps as far as Europe. He'll do there.'"

This kind of oppression is exercised the more easily because hired labourers are generally new comers, Germans or Irish, who have not learned to combine for their own defence. No man remains a labourer a moment longer than he can help it. His great ambition is to buy land, and to be his own master. If he is content to take land uncleared, and at some distance from a road, he will get it at five shillings an acre; and if he buys directly from the government, even this price need not be paid at once. If, however, he wishes to purchase land which is already partly cleared, he takes it off the hands of some speculating settler, who sells the improvements at a good profit, and goes off further into the interior to prepare another untouched allotment for another



sale. If he is particular about facilities of carriage, he probably buys the land from a railway company. In the Western States the usual history of a railroad is, that the company has bought a large tract of land from the government at five shillings an acre, and then run a line through it, looking to make their profits, not from their traffic receipts, but from the sale of the lands which the new line will be the means of opening up for settlement. In these Western States the railway holds quite a different position from what it does in Europe. Its object is not to answer the demand for carriage, but to create it. In fact, throughout a large part of the country there are no other roads; if you leave the rails, you must take to the fields or the forest.

Mr. Trollope did not find the railways a very comfortable mode of travelling. The want of any distinction of classes would alone prevent that. Luxurious as Americans may be, if they like, in their houses, dinners, carriages, or horses, if they want to travel they must submit to "public opinion," and take their chance in the common car. It is curious to notice how aristocratic and democratic intolerance can start from opposite poles and yet arrive at the common goal of a sumptuary law. The one says to those below its own class, "You shall not dress, or eat, or travel as I do;" the other says to all above it, "I cannot do as you do, but I can make you do as I do." As far, however, as railways are concerned, the poorer classes suffer in pocket, if they gain in dignity. If you force the companies to strike an average for all passengers, they must raise the fares at one end in proportion as they lower them at the other, and the ordinary rate of payment is consequently quite threehalfpence a mile. A half fare additional is a good deal to pay for the privilege of knowing that your richer neighbour is just as uncomfortable as yourself, and probably suffers from it a good deal more. The same feeling shows itself in America in other ways. The Maine liquor law, indeed, which generally strikes an Englishman as the most flagrant instance of interference with personal liberty, is defended by its advocates on other grounds; and though it is still nominally in force throughout the New England States, it seems to be very generally evaded. At least, though the hostess at Portland declined to sell Mr. Trollope any thing to drink, she placed a bottle of porter by his side at dinner, for which she made no charge; so that perhaps the liquor of the community is always paid for under some other name. It is proper to add, however, that according to some authorities such a concession as this involved no violation of the spirit of a law against intoxicating drinks; for when Mr.

Trollope pointed out to a man who was driving him that Scotch ale and bitter beer were advertised for sale in the shop windows, and suggested that a man might get drunk on them, he received for answer, "Wa'al, yes; if he goes to work hard and drinks a bucketful, perhaps he may." But in hotels,—and hotels are a much more important element in American life than they are in that of any other country,—there is very little freedom of action. When the traveller arrives, he finds that in the matter of rooms he has but little choice. He inscribes his name in a book and prefers his requests to the clerk, who probably takes no heed of them, though half a dozen loungers will do their best to make up for his inattention by carefully spelling the name of the new-comer, and listening attentively to what he says.

"That necessity of making your request for rooms before a public audience is not in itself agreeable, and sometimes entails a conversation which might be more comfortably made in private. What do you mean by a dressing-room, and why do you want one? Now that is a question which an Englishman feels awkward at answering before five-and-twenty Americans, but it has to be answered."

In all but the very largest hotels the table-d'hôte system is carried out with great rigidity. If you do not get up at the very instant the morning gong sounds, or if you cannot compress your toilet within the allotted thirty minutes between that time and breakfast, you must submit to making that meal under surveillance. The attendants stand over you, filling your cup the moment it is empty, and your plate while you are in the very act of conveying the last morsel to your mouth. You are late, and you must be shown that time is valuable. Even when the guest, warned by experience, is punctual to the moment, and his movements are covered by the presence of numbers, the final cause of his being there at all is kept before him with disagreeable prominence. Food is taken separately from conversation, and at dinner meat is taken separately from drink. The whole of the United States seems to be in the condition of English confectioners before Mr. Gladstone instituted cheap wines and refreshment licenses. You may "liquor up" after dinner, certainly (except in New England), just as you may liquor up before dinner, or at any other hour of the day; but there is not supposed to be any special fitness in that time; and then, as always, it must be done at the bar. Tea is another great corporate meal; so that there seems to be but little exaggeration in Mr. Trollope's conclusion,—*"in an American hotel one can never do as one pleases."* In the Western cities the hotels recognise no class



distinctions, nor do they prescribe to their guests any standard of dress or manners.

"In the inn at Rolla was a public room, heated in the middle by a stove, and round that we soon found ourselves seated in a company of soldiers, farmers, labourers, and teamsters. . . . The teamsters greased their boots, the soldiers snored, those who were wet took off their shoes and stockings, hanging them to dry round the stove; and the Western farmers chewed tobacco in silence and ruminated. At such a house all the guests go in to their meals together. A gong is sounded on a sudden close behind your ears; accustomed as you may probably be to the sound, you jump up from your chair in the agony of the crash, and by the time that you have collected your thoughts the whole crowd is off, in a general stampede, into the eating-room. You may as well join them; if you hesitate as to feeding with so rough a lot of men, you will have to sit down afterwards with the women and children of the family, and your lot will then be worse. The men are dirty and civil, the women are dirty and uncivil."

There must be many Americans to whom all this is as disagreeable as it is to foreigners. But they never seem to make any complaints. Indeed, the extreme patience with which they put up with avoidable misfortunes is one of the most noticeable features of their character. They are patient in great matters,—patient under martial law, patient under the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, patient under arbitrary arrests; but it is not this which is so remarkable. Indifference to the acts of a government, provided that you have the choice of it, is a common characteristic of democracies; and where the whole community suffer, the keenness of individual discomfort is dulled by the consciousness that all are faring alike. The peculiarity of the Americans is, that they seem to let prosperity go as easily as freedom. In Missouri Mr. Trollope fell in with a farmer, going down, under the protection of the Northern army, to see if there were any remains of his property to be found. His house had been burnt, his stock and crops carried off, and his farm had become a wilderness; but he only "guessed things were pretty rough." Within the lines of the army of the Potomac there were farm-houses standing which were still occupied by their old inhabitants. The land was overrun by soldiers, the fences destroyed, the stock hastily sold for what it would fetch; it was impossible to till the ground; people stayed only because they had at least a roof over their heads; and yet the men stood with their hands in their pockets, knowing they were ruined, but making no complaints. And this was not to be ascribed to patriotism; for in most cases these men were secessionist in their sympathies, and therefore politically as

well as personally hostile to the soldiers around them. The same peculiarity makes its appearance in other ways. Mr. Trollope happened several times to be kept waiting for hours in the course of a railway journey, by an accident, or by arriving too late for a train which was to take him on somewhere else. We all know how an Englishman employs himself on such occasions. He talks about special trains at the company's expense, or threatens to write to the *Times*. But an American, especially an American of the Western States, does not seem to need any safety-valves of this kind. He has no spare excitement to get rid of. As Mr. Trollope was crossing the Alleghanies, one of the driving-wheels of the engine broke, and delayed the train for some hours.

"Some of the younger men got out, and looked at the ruined wheel; but most of the passengers kept their seats, chewed their tobacco, and went to sleep. . . . I did not hear a word of complaint, nor yet a word of surprise or thankfulness that the accident had been attended with no serious results. 'I have got a furlough for ten days,' one soldier said to me. 'And I have missed every connection all through from Washington here. I shall have just time to turn round and go back, when I get home.' But he did not seem to be in any way dissatisfied. He had not referred to his relations when he spoke of 'missing his connections,' but to his want of good fortune as regarded railway travelling. He had reached Baltimore too late for the train on to Harrisburg, and Harrisburg too late for the train on to Pittsburg. Now he must again reach Pittsburg too late for his further journey. But nevertheless he seemed well pleased with his position."

In no other national character that we know of are there such strongly marked contrasts observable as in the American. The same man will display an intense passion for getting money and a stoical indifference to losing it, an absorbing devotion to business and an apparently unlimited capacity for "loafing" away his time. The American, whether of the Eastern or Western States, looks upon wealth as Lessing looked upon truth. The search for it is more precious to him than the possession. He values each successful speculation mainly as the stepping-stone to a new one. "As for his children, he has no desire of leaving them money. Let the girls marry. And for the boys,—for them it will be good to begin as he began." So again with his time. No man is more industrious; but then no man combines with his industry a larger capacity for pure idleness. Long railway journeys, days spent on board river steam-boats, hours of waiting, never seem to trouble him. He throws himself into some contorted position, thrusts his hands into his pockets,



—and sits. He does not talk ; he does not smoke ; perhaps he chews tobacco, but it is so slowly as hardly to constitute an occupation ; he simply “loafs.” These characteristics are especially to be found in the West. In the older States men are more sociable. They will rarely speak unless they are spoken to, but when they are spoken to, they are ready enough to converse. But the Western man loves silence for its own sake. He is not uncourteous ; he answers your questions, and if you ask for special information he will even take some trouble to give it you, but he does so with the smallest possible expenditure of words, using monosyllables only where they are necessary, and preferring a gesture of the head. On the Upper Mississippi, the boat in which Mr. Trollope was travelling had to lie-to for the greater part of a day to repair a paddle-wheel. Most of the passengers went on shore ; but though a settler’s cabin stood close to the spot where they landed, Mr. Trollope was the only person who spoke a word to the inmates. Dirt is another Western peculiarity,—not unknown, indeed, in the Eastern States, but culminating and reaching its highest development in the West. We are accustomed to look upon dirt rather as an effect than a cause ; but it would be a curious speculation to inquire how much of what we may call the unhappiness of the American character is due to a skin which is never cleansed. There is another external cause, too, which must influence the moral as well as the physical temperament. For half the year the American never, if he can help it, breathes the open air. The winters are long and severe, and he guards against them by keeping up a uniform temperature in house, church, theatre, shop, steam-boat, and railway-car, which to an Englishman would be simply intolerable. Stoves and heating apparatus turn every room into a furnace. The pale faces, shrivelled skins, and premature old age of Americans attest the effect of all this on the health ; but we can hardly suppose that the mischief stops there. At least to English prejudices, fresh air and cold water seem as essential to the sound mind as to the sound body. A Frenchman would probably think many of these defects atoned for by the scrupulous adherence to French taste and French models which he would meet with throughout the United States.

“ When I complained to a landlord of an hotel out in the West, that his furniture was useless ; that I could not write at a marble table whose outside rim was curved into fantastic shapes ; that a gold clock in my bedroom, which did not go, gave me no aid in washing myself ; that a heavy immoveable curtain shut out the light ; and that papier-mâché chairs, with small flappy velvet seats, were bad to

sit on,—he answered me completely by telling me that his house had been furnished, not in accordance with the taste of England, but with that of France. I acknowledged the rebuke, gave up my pursuits of literature and cleanliness, and hurried out of the house as quickly as I could.”

In many of the educated classes of the Eastern States, and especially of New York, this admiration of French models is not confined to matters of taste; it extends to politics also. They are democrats who have grown disgusted with the form which democracy wears in their own country, and have come to regard the French empire as the truest ideal of democratic government. Certainly, where the will of the majority is the only law, there is an obvious convenience in having the majority represented by one man, the process of determining the law being thereby greatly simplified. And it has the further advantage of leaving the rest of the nation at liberty to devote itself uninterruptedly to the pursuit of animal pleasure, intellectual amusement, and moral repose. That it is a state which, since the era of the *coup-d'état*, has been consistently spurned by every Frenchman who has any tastes above the level of the feuilleton of an emasculated newspaper, is not material. It is, after all, a question of instinct; and who shall venture to pronounce one man's instinct superior to another's? Whatever there may be to be said for or against this theory, we have no wish to dispute its perfect logical consistency.

Such, at least in part, are the men of the United States. But Mr. Trollope's pen finds even more congenial employment in sketching the women and children. The manners of the American women of the lower class are, he does not scruple to say, “more odious than those of any other human beings” he has met with; and in this opinion he is supported by many of their own countrymen. They have presumed upon that scrupulous deference to their sex which, until General Butler arose to demonstrate that it is only skin-deep, was always regarded as one of the most notable features of the Northern character. They avail themselves of every proffered attention (we cannot say they accept it, for that would imply some recognition of him who offers it), but they do this without thanks and without acknowledgment. They take it as a right conceded as a matter of course by some inferior animal,—by a dog, for instance, who jumps off a chair when he sees some one about to sit down upon him. It is not wonderful that the younger men are beginning to grow tired of such treatment, and to talk of bringing women to their senses by cutting off the supply of courtesies. But of the



women of the middle class Mr. Trollope has a higher opinion. Their faults are rather the result of a total absence of domestic life.

"Housekeeping is not popular with young married people in America; and there are various reasons why this should be so. Men there are not fixed in their employment as they are with us. If a young Benedick cannot get along as a lawyer at Salem, perhaps he may thrive as a shoemaker at Thermopylæ. Jefferson B. Johnson fails in the lumber line at Eleutheria; but hearing of an opening for a Baptist preacher at Big Mud Creek, moves himself off with his wife and three children at a week's notice. Aminadab Wiggs takes an engagement as a clerk at a steam-boat office on the Pongowonga River, but he goes to his employment with an inward conviction that six months will see him earning his bread elsewhere. Under such circumstances, even a large wardrobe is a nuisance, and a collection of furniture would be as appropriate as a drove of elephants."

Accordingly, the American husband brings home his bride to an hotel. Their family life is the ceaseless routine of table-d'hôte breakfasts, dinners, and teas we have described above. Except at meals they see but little of each other; for Mr. Trollope testifies that neither husband nor lover can endure the dullness of the "ladies' drawing-room" at an hotel for many consecutive minutes. So they follow French fashions in this respect also, and go into society by themselves,—society probably meaning to the lady an evening visit to a lecture-hall, to the gentleman a "liquor up" at the bar. Publicity, however, seems to inflict no discomfort on the American woman. At breakfast or at dinner she is fully equal to her position. But, for all that, her appearance at these critical moments is hardly attractive.

"The anxious study, the elaborate reading of the daily book, and then the choice, proclaimed with clear articulation,—'Boiled mutton and caper-sauce, roast duck, hashed venison, mashed potatoes, poached eggs and spinach, stewed tomatoes. Yes; and, waiter,—some squash.' There is no false delicacy in the voice by which this order is given, no desire for a gentle whisper. The dinner is ordered with the firm determination of an American heroine, and in some five minutes' time all the little dishes appear at once, and the lady is surrounded by her banquet."

And, as a monster hotel is the first home of the newly-married pair, so is it the earliest nursery of their offspring. American children begin life on their own account almost in the cradle.

"The actual age of these perfectly-civilised and highly-educated beings may be from three to four. One will often see five or six such seated at the long dinner-table of the hotel, breakfasting and

dining with their elders, and going through the ceremony with all the gravity, and more than all the decorum, of their grandfathers. . . . . The adult infant lisps to the waiter for every thing at the table, handles his fish with epicurean delicacy, is choice in his selection of pickles, very particular that his beefsteak at breakfast shall be hot, and is instant in his demand for fresh ice in his water. . . . The little precocious full-blown beauty of four signifies that she has completed her meal,—or is ‘through’ her dinner, as she would express it,—by carefully extricating herself from the napkin which has been tucked around her. Then the waiter, ever attentive to her movements, draws back the chair on which she is seated, and the young lady glides to the floor. A little girl in old England would scramble down, but little girls in new England never scramble. Her father and mother, who are no more than her chief ministers, walk before her out of the saloon, and then she—swims after them. . . . As a comedy at an hotel it is very delightful, but in private life I should object to it.”

Perhaps after this our readers will not be surprised to learn that American babies struck Mr. Trollope as an unhappy race of beings; that “discontent and dyspepsia” abound, that childish roses fade before the infant has learned to walk, and that childish ways and childish pleasures seem absolutely unknown.

There is much even in the non-political part of Mr. Trollope's volumes that we have left unnoticed. But we should not be dealing fairly either by him or the Americans if we did not record that, notwithstanding all the unpleasing peculiarities we have dwelt upon, and some others we have passed by, the ultimate judgment which he passes upon their character and institutions is a favourable one; more favourable, we must confess, than we can see grounds for; more favourable, we believe, than he himself would have pronounced, if he had not been influenced by an over-anxious desire to be strictly and scrupulously just. Against all the disadvantages—and he admits they are many—under which they labour he sets two advantages, which he thinks sufficient to weigh down the balance in their favour. They are educated, and they are rich. Of the truth of the first of these qualifications there can be no doubt. Primary education is far more universal in the United States than it is in England, and it implies a good deal more. Reading, writing, and arithmetic, are an almost universal possession, and they are not left unused. A certain kind of intelligence is very widely diffused over the whole mass of the people; they can all talk politics; they can all look after their own interests; they can all take care that no one infringes upon their sense of personal independence. That even this last step is, in its degree, a gain to the community



we do not for a moment dispute. If a man does not feel that he has any superiors, it is better in the long-run for all parties that he should no longer be forced by circumstances to act as though he did feel it. He is not more conceited, and he is more honest. But there must, for all that, be something deficient in a training of which this sentiment is a conspicuous result. And besides this, there is another charge to be brought against the system. It nourishes small men at the expense of great men. The average of political intelligence, for instance, may be much higher in the American States than in any European country, but it is an average which is gained by depression as well as by elevation. If the mass are higher, the number of those who rise above the mass is very much smaller. But this change is not an unmixed good even for the mass of the people themselves. They have no one to guide them; and the history, short as it is, of the present civil war shows that there may be as much suffering—even sheer physical suffering—caused by want of guidance as by any more material deficiency. Nor can we quite agree with Mr. Trollope in the view he takes of the astonishing industrial advancement of the United States. Doubtless the fact that wealth has been thereby distributed over a far larger area affords just ground for satisfaction. But Mr. Trollope seems to us to assign much too high a value to the American idea of progress. "I will believe no man," he says, "who tells me that he would sooner earn one dollar a day than two . . . Under circumstances that are the same, and to a man who is sane, a whole loaf is better than half, and two loaves are better than one." Granted; but the argument will not admit of indefinite extension. A competence is better than a pittance, though it be earned by double the toil; but it does not follow that great wealth is better than moderate wealth, if the cost of obtaining it is to be doubled also. Money and the labour which brings money are not ends in themselves. A man who has made 50,000*l.* in the first half of his life has profited little by his success if he values it only as giving him the means of making 100,000*l.* more in the second half. So, in another place, Mr. Trollope represents a Canadian as saying, "I do not know that we are richer" (*i. e.* than the inhabitants of the States), "but on the whole we are doing better and are happier;" and then he adds, "Men and women do, I suppose, learn to be happier when they learn to disregard riches; but such a doctrine is absolutely false as regards a nation." We own to doubting the possibility of any doctrine being *always* true when applied to individuals, and *always* false when applied to communities. A nation is made up of units;

and if the units taken separately are happy, they can hardly be otherwise taken together. In spite of the latest American glosses, the life *is* more than meat, and the body than raiment. There is a passage on this subject in Mr. Mill's *Political Economy* which expresses our meaning so exactly, that we cannot end our criticisms better than by bringing it to the recollection of our readers:—"I confess I am not charmed with the ideal of life held out by those who think that the normal state of human beings is that of struggling to get on; that the trampling, crushing, elbowing, and treading on each other's heels, which form the existing type of social life, are the most desirable lot of human kind, or any thing but the disagreeable symptoms of one of the phases of industrial progress. The Northern and Middle States of America are a specimen of this stage of civilisation in very favourable circumstances; having apparently got rid of all social injustices and inequalities that affect persons of Caucasian race and of the male sex; while the proportion to capital and land is such as to insure abundance to every able-bodied member of the community who does not forfeit it by misconduct. They have the six points of Chartism, and they have no poverty: and all that these advantages seem to have yet done for them is, that the life of the whole of one sex is devoted to dollar-hunting, and of the other to breeding dollar-hunters. This is not a kind of social perfection which philanthropists to come will feel any very eager desire to assist in realising."

---



## SAVAGE LIFE IN AFRICA.

[COMMUNICATED.]

THE spirit of discovery, finding that the East and West are for the present well-nigh exhausted in novelty, has of late years set itself with great zeal to make researches in Africa; and the labours of men like Livingstone, Barth, Burton, and several others less celebrated, have accumulated a mass of evidence from which the ethnologist can draw many interesting conclusions. It is true that there is hardly so much in Africa to fascinate the imagination as is found either in Asia or in America. If we leave out of reckoning Egypt,—that mysterious seat of a civilisation which is hardly to be called African, but stands as it were in a region of its own,—nowhere else in that ill-fated continent has history recorded any thing which the African races have contributed to human progress. Whatever has been done is to be assigned to colonies, either Carthaginian, Greek, Roman, or Saracen. Among the native Africans a few barbaric dynasties are all that relieve a history of continuous slavery and degradation, of wars truly like those of “kites and crows flocking and fighting in the air.” Notwithstanding this, even the phenomena of degradation, like those of disease, are not wanting in an interest of their own; and we are not driven in despair to the contemplation of physical nature alone, in which Africa still, in many parts, presents an image of antediluvian times. In negro superstition, we see at work a set of causes which were once powerful in nations and ages the most conspicuous for intellectual development; an instinct of the human mind which, left to itself, produces only wild fear, and cruelty, its perpetual attendant, and which finds its due nourishment and control in that religion alone which has revealed to man the true relations of matter and spirit. Some traces are discernible which hereafter may aid us in determining relations of high interest in connection with Egypt; whilst to the political speculator the aspects of servitude in its native home are curious and instructive in a remarkable degree.

In treating of these and other questions, I may seem to have undertaken too wide a field in proposing “savage life in Africa” as the subject of the present paper. That vast continent comprises, even in those parts which are absolutely savage, races of very varying characteristics. The Caffre is different indeed from the Boschman or Namaqua; or, to take tribes of a higher grade, from half-civilised savages like those of Da-

homey. In Eastern Africa are numerous tribes, Wazaramo, Wagogo, Wanyamwezi, and others, each requiring to be placed in a distinct class, on grounds which would well reward study. And in equatorial Africa there is the same variety, which I need not detail in this place. Their languages also, whilst reducible to extensive groups, and even to two very large classes, exhibit distinctions no less numerous. Still, just as, in spite of all the manifold differences of the states of modern Europe, civilised Europeans have a number of broad features in common, so the various races of Africa may be considered as possessing certain ways and institutions which are more or less familiar to all. In every part of Africa the traveller seems to find fetichism to exist; in every part there is slavery; and the political customs, if one may apply such a term to the savage organisation which exists among the comparatively superior races, are generally formed upon one prevailing type. I will attempt the discussion of some of the most curious of these aspects, in particular the religious character of the African races, and the institution of slavery, as it exists among them. For the sake of distinctness, I will premise certain great divisions of the native races, made by the most recent travellers, such as Livingstone, Burton, Fleming, and Du Chaillu, in the regions studied by them. The aboriginal race of South Africa appears to have been the Hottentots, who were found in possession in 1652, on the settlement of the country by the Dutch, to whom they ceded the land before retiring towards the interior by the eastern coast. Coincidentally with those events, the Caffres, a more highly-developed race, were descending from the north, from causes not ascertained, and turned back the advance of the Hottentots, who then moved in a north-westerly direction towards Namaqua-land, and in those regions became separated into three great divisions, the Hottentots proper (now much reduced in numbers), Korunnas, and greater and lesser Namaquas. They are a degraded and dwarfish race, long-armed and sinewy, with features of extreme ugliness, described as caricaturing those of the Egyptian Copts. The language of these tribes has been styled the *Click-class*, from a peculiar clicking sound given to certain letters in it, very difficult to be acquired by Europeans, who always seem to stammer when they attempt it.<sup>1</sup> Still more degraded than these, but another branch of the same race, are the Boschmen, Bushmen, or Bosjesmans, in whom reason is principally exhibited in the form of cunning, by which they ensnare the game on which they depend for existence. These miserable people are perhaps

<sup>1</sup> Fleming's Southern Africa, pp. 139, 155.



descended from some tribe dispossessed of their lands by war, and driven in consequence to adopt the nomade life. Among the more advanced Caffre tribes, Mr. Casalis notices a similarly degenerate people, the Balolas, roaming in the deserts in the vicinity of tribes comparatively social.<sup>2</sup> The Caffres are a race strikingly different from the rest, with features approaching to the Caucasian type, though they are woolly-haired, and black or tawny. They may be classed into two great divisions, the Caffres proper and the Bechuanas. The former inhabit the eastern part of southern Africa, from Cape Colony as far as Mozambique, and are good specimens of "the noble savage," of whose habits I shall presently say more. The Caffres are subdivided into many groups, as the Amakosa, Amaponda, Abatempa, &c., with whom also may be classed the Zulus of Natal. Of all the Caffre tribes, the Basutos, who dwell west of the Malutis, a mountain-range separating Natal from the country of the Bechuanas (of whom presently), appear to be among the most important. They are considered by Casalis to be composed of the various branches of the Caffre race, and to afford the most complete type of their character, manners, and institutions. The Bechuanas, the second great division of the Caffre race, are extensively spread over the central region of South Africa. They are less martial and less addicted to the chase than the principal branch. Their physical development is also described as inferior, but they have much capacity for commerce. A remarkable tribe, the Makalolo, of Basuto origin, is found high up in the north, many hundred miles from their original seats. They were formed in 1824 by a remarkable chief named Sebituane, who was driven from the south, among a vast horde of savages, by a mongrel race, the Griquas.<sup>3</sup> His history and that of his tribe, as related by Livingstone, is a very interesting example of the immense tribal changes which are constantly going on in Africa, and of the more important of which, those, namely, which brought the Caffres from the remote interior, we know nothing.

The elaborate researches of Captain Burton have accumulated an amount of information on central East Africa which rivals in richness of detail the great model of all travellers—Herodotus. Commencing with the shore of the Indian Ocean, opposite to the island of Zanzibar, the expedition he commanded explored in 1857-59 a line of nearly 1000 miles into the interior, terminating with the great Tanganyika lake westward. A strip of country about the coast, called the

<sup>2</sup> The Basutos, by the Rev. E. Casalis, p. xv.

<sup>3</sup> Livingstone's Missionary Travels in South Africa, p. 59.

Mrima, is inhabited by half-caste Arabs, and by a race called the Wamrima, or coast-clans, who are Negroids, more closely approaching the African type. Further north on the coast are the Wasawahili, also an African people, half-Semitic from mixture with Arab blood. They appear degenerate races, grafting the cunning of a barbarous civilisation on the wildness and superstition of their native stock. Quitting them, the tracts of country traversed by Captain Burton are divided by him into four regions, according to their geological and ethnological characteristics. The first of these, stretching from the coast to the mountain-chain forming the land of Usagara, is inhabited by tribes called the Wazaramo, the Wak'hutu, and Waziraha. The first are agricultural, but, corrupted by the proximity of civilisation, are dangerous to caravans, and, being slave-importers, are a mixed race. They are comparatively advanced in comforts, more so than the others, and have some remarkable social customs, to which we shall hereafter advert. The second region, stretching from the western frontier of K'hutu to the flat table-land of Ugogo, is a mountainous district, like the eastern Ghauts of the Indian peninsula, inhabited by the Wasagara and other tribes much addicted to pilfering. They too are of very varying complexions, some approaching black, the others chocolate-coloured. Captain Burton describes their mode of dressing their hair as extremely curious, and resembling the coiffure of ancient Egypt. The third region consists of the table-land of Ugogo, already mentioned, extending 155 geographical miles to Tura, the eastern district of Unyamwezi. Here inhabit the Wagogo and the Wahumba; the former a mixed race again, from their being slave-purchasers. They barter ivory for slaves, and are so greedy of them that every gang leaves some among their population. They are conspicuous for a practice common in East Africa, of distending the lobes of the ear to an extravagant degree. The territory of Unyamwezi comes next, of which the principal province is Unyanyembe, a remarkable district, which is the great point of departure for caravans radiating from thence into the interior of central inter-tropical Africa. Here many Arab merchants are settled, whose factors and slaves travel for them about the country. Considerably to the north of the line I have described are countries as yet unexplored, but which promise greater interest to the adventurer than these. They are called the Northern Kingdoms, and are said to exhibit a civilisation of a higher kind than even the most advanced savages in the east and south have attained to.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Burton's *Lake Regions of Central Africa*, vol. i.



M. du Chaillu's explorations were carried on in western equatorial Africa, in the countries watered by the Muni, Gaboon, Ogobai, and Rembi rivers. Of the coast-tribes he takes the Mpongwe as an average type. They are remarkable, as barbarians, for a great love of trade, in which they show a good deal of intelligence, and are, as might be expected, comparatively prosperous and comfortable. The trade is carried on in a singular manner. The great rivers furnish the only highways of commerce, and these are possessed by the various tribes along their banks. The products of the interior, whether ivory, ebony, bar-wood, or slaves, are passed along from tribe to tribe, each charging a percentage on the transmission. The custom of the country enforces this arrangement, which individuals may not transgress by trading for themselves. It is very advantageous to the last agent; but the shares of profit transmitted up the country diminish as they reach the originator of the transaction, who often gets little or nothing. The importance of the rivers in their commerce is one cause of the changes constantly going on in this state of the African tribes, which disappear in an extraordinary manner. The stronger races are constantly encroaching on the weaker, to get possession of the lands adjoining the rivers. The most enterprising tribe M. du Chaillu seems to have met with were the Fans, a cannibal people, but capable, however, of being reclaimed, who are pressing year by year further westward towards the Gaboon. The Bakalai are a roving race, found widely scattered both on the coast and far inland. Another important nomade people are the Shekianis, split up into many subdivisions.<sup>5</sup> The mission of Commander Forbes to Dahomey, in 1849-50, was the means of obtaining many curious facts with reference to that kingdom, which, from a very small beginning in the seventeenth century, has grown by the conquests accumulated in its slave-hunts (for the term war is too dignified for such expeditions) to the position of a very extensive military state, extending 180 miles from east to west, and 200 miles into the interior of Western Africa.<sup>6</sup>

The celebrated word "fetichism," which is used in general to describe the African belief in the supernatural, is derived from the Portuguese "feitiço," which means "a doing," *i. e.* of magic, speaking euphemistically. But although magic is intimately connected with it, the term fetichism seems to carry other predicates also in its signification. It may be understood as all that vague dread of material objects which arbi-

<sup>5</sup> Du Chaillu's *Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa*, cc. vii. viii., &c.

<sup>6</sup> *Dahomey and the Dahomans*, by Commander Fred. E. Forbes, ch. i.

trarily occupies the imagination, where the idea of God either has been lost, or has become even more degraded than we find it in a connected system of idolatry like that of the paganism of the classical nations of antiquity, or of modern India. It is very difficult to state any precise view of belief as existing among people so degenerate as the African tribes. They themselves hardly know what they believe; and though traces may certainly be alleged of higher religious ideas than seem to belong to savages, practically speaking their notions of the supernatural turn chiefly upon two points—dread of the spirits of the departed and of witchcraft. Mr. Casalis tells us the Caffre tribes with whom he was familiar “had entirely lost the idea of a Creator;” that all the natives whom he ever questioned on the subject assured him that “it never entered their heads that the earth and sky might be the work of an invisible being.” They explained the existence of the world by a word in their language signifying “*having always been—to exist in an incomprehensible manner.*”<sup>7</sup> The Protestant Bishop Colenso, indeed, ascribes to them “a distinct traditionary belief in the Supreme Being, whom they acknowledge under the two-fold titles of *Umkulunkulu*, ‘the great essence,’ and *Umvelinqange*, ‘the first comer-out;’” but admits that “of him and his attributes they understand nothing, and neither worship nor invoke him.”<sup>8</sup> Mr. Livingstone says, in a loose and unsatisfactory manner, “the existence of a God and of a future state has always been admitted by all the Bechuanas;” but further down tells us that the want of any outward form of worship makes the Bechuanas appear among the most godless races of mortals.<sup>9</sup>

The following is the clear statement of Captain Burton with reference to the East Africans: “[Fetichism] admits neither God, nor angel, nor devil; it ignores the very alphabet of revealed or traditionary religion—a creation, a resurrection, a judgment-day, a soul or a spirit, a heaven or a hell. A modified practical atheism is thus the prominent feature of the superstition. Though instinctively conscious of a being above them, the Africans have as yet failed to grasp the idea; in their feeble minds it is an embryo rather than a conception—at the best a vague God, without personality, attribute, or providence. They call that being Mulungu, the Uhlunga of the Kafirs, and the Utika of the Hottentots. The term, however, may mean a ghost, the firmament, or the sun; a man will frequently call himself Mulunga, and even Mulunga Mbaya,—the latter word signifying bad or wicked. In the

<sup>7</sup> Casalis, p. 238.

<sup>8</sup> Fleming, p. 259.

<sup>9</sup> Livingstone, p. 107.



language of the Wamasai, 'Ai,' or with the article 'Engai'—the Creator—is feminine, the God and rain being synonymous."<sup>10</sup>

The word *utika* seems to be the same with that given by Mr. Appleyard as *u Tixo*, which he calls a Kaffir word, probably derived from the Hottentot *Tshoei-'koop* (though the resemblance appears very remote). He says that the word means "the wounded knee," and was originally applied to a Hottentot or Namaqua sorcerer of great fame some generations back. This man had received some injury in his knee, whence this appellation was given him, under which he continued to be invoked after his death, and "became, in process of time, the nearest in idea to their first conceptions of God."<sup>11</sup> Referring again to Mr. Casalis's account, we find that the natives call every being to whom they render adoration *molimo*, a word which consists of the prefix *mo*, attached to almost all words representing intelligent beings, and *holimo*, "above—in the sky."<sup>12</sup> But it is plain nothing can be more indefinite than this, and that practically it comes to the same thing with the view taken by Captain Burton. Quite analogous to the evidence of the southern and eastern travellers is that of M. du Chaillu for western equatorial Africa. He says, "the name Aniambié stands, I think, for God; but yet they have no idea of a supreme and almighty Spirit, Creator, and Preserver. The word *aniemba*, which sounds much like the previously-named, and is probably derived from the same root, signifies 'possessed by a witch.'" He says he found,

<sup>10</sup> Burton, ii. 342. It does not at all follow that because a savage calls God and the sky by the same name, therefore he necessarily confuses one with the other. Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins had one name for spirit, breath, and wind; but we cannot therefore conclude that they identified them. The foundation of reason is the power of using symbols, *i.e.* of making one thing stand for another which is known to be different from it.

It is doubtful too whether travellers in Africa have made allowance for the shyness of the savage, and his horror at the idea of telling his traditional beliefs to the white man. The following passage from M. Gobineau, *De l'Inégalité des Races humaines*, i. 165, though written of the Celtic peasantry of France, applies to all other races in proportion to their uncivilised condition: "Quant aux croyances . . . les évêques et les curés ont à lutter, non moins aujourd'hui qu'il y a un siècle, qu'il y en a cinq, qu'il y en a quinze, contre des préventions et des tendances transmises héréditairement, et d'autant plus à redouter que, ne s'avouant presque jamais, elles ne se laissent, ni combattre, ni vaincre. Il n'est pas de prêtre éclairé, ayant évangélisé des villages, qui ne sache avec quelle astuce profonde le paysan, même dévot, continue à cacher, à caresser au fond de son esprit, quelque idée traditionnelle, dont l'existence ne se révèle que malgré lui et dans de rares instants. Lui en parle-t-on? il nie, n'accepte jamais la discussion, et demeure inébranlablement convaincu." Possibly missionaries and travellers in Africa may not be more successful in drawing the secret of his belief out of a savage negro than the French priest out of the Gaulish peasant.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted by Fleming, p. 158.

<sup>12</sup> Casali, p. 248.

among all the tribes he visited in that quarter, the belief in the existence of two great spirits, evil, though sometimes willing to do good, and the one much less than the other. These spirits are called, one Abambou or Ocoucou, and the other Mbuirri; they are invoked in sickness or other grave occasions.<sup>13</sup> Thus we find once more that religious notions among the Africans are feeble and indistinct. Our attention is for a moment arrested by something resembling the double principle of the Manichæans, but we find it as confused as their idea of a God. When the existence of God is forced upon their reflections, they are apt to break out into blasphemies at once of the most frightful and the most childish kind, desiring to be revenged on the Almighty for the losses they believe Him to have caused, of friends, relatives, and cattle. They have idols certainly, but not idols with a history, like those of the old pagan nations. They are rather to be described as monstrous representations with which their notions of supernatural power are bound up. For example, Dr. Livingstone mentions a tribe in the far interior where he was told, that though the idol could not itself hear, the owners had medicines by which it could be made to hear and give responses. Every thing is steeped with the notion of magic and conjuring. Their belief in the power of the spirits of the departed over the living is one that fills the mind of the African with terror. The Basutos think that the souls of their ancestors are constantly endeavouring to draw them to themselves.<sup>14</sup> Every disease is attributed to them, and sacrifices are offered to appease them. Similarly the East Africans attribute all diseases to an evil ghost, generally that of a Moslem;<sup>15</sup> and in Western Africa M. du Chaillu found the natives dreaded the soul of the deceased, as a vindictive thing to be feared and conciliated, which was effected by offerings of food. Although, however, the fear of death and of the dead is a very marked feature in the mind of the Africans, yet they show even in this the shortness of thought which is characteristic of the barbarians. M. du Chaillu observes of the Western Africans of the Equator: "They fear the spirits of the *recently* departed; and, besides placing furniture, dress, and food at their graves, return from time to time with other supplies of food. When men and women are slain over a grave, they even believe that their spirits join that of him in whose honour they have been killed. During the season appointed for mourning, the deceased is remembered and *feared*; but when once his memory grows dim, the Negro ceases to

<sup>13</sup> Du Chaillu, xix.<sup>15</sup> Burton, ii. 352.<sup>14</sup> Casalis, p. 249.



believe in the prolonged existence of the departed spirit. Ask a Negro where the spirit of his grandfather or great-grandfather—whom he did not know—is, and he will reply confidently that it is ‘done,’ ‘gone out,’ ‘no more,’ or that he does not know where it has gone.”<sup>16</sup>

It is generally taken for granted that sacrifices over the dead are intended by the Africans, like the offerings made by the ancient Scythians and by the American Indians, to surround the departed with beings or instruments such as aided him when living. Whether this is universally the view to be adopted is perhaps uncertain. The ancient Greek notion evidently was to minister life-blood to the feeble, joyless spirit, as it languidly roamed through Hades.<sup>17</sup> Dahomey is the country where human sacrifices to the dead are celebrated on the largest scale. At the Feast of Customs in July 1860 five human victims were sacrificed, who were charged with messages to the spirit of the late King Guezo. In the course of the feast, which lasted above a month, and is regularly held previously to going to war, hundreds of human beings were massacred, by way of sending attendants to wait on him in the other world.<sup>18</sup> The horrors of this kind which prevail in that barbarous kingdom fall, indeed, little short of what we read to have been practised in Mexico up to the time of the Spanish conquest. Many of the Caffre tribes acknowledge as their national gods the ancestors of their chiefs; yet even among them the ancient deities are regarded as less accessible, though more powerful, than the new ones, and the latter are invited to supplicate the former in their behalf.

In Africa there is no such order of men as a priesthood. The person who with them corresponds to the priest is the *mganga*, *ouganga*, *ngaka*, or “medicine-man,” as the travellers commonly call him. He combines the functions of doctor, rain-maker, witch-finder, augur, and similar crafts. He conjures diseases, that is, the malignant ghosts by which they are believed to be caused, out of the bodies of the sufferers into some inanimate object—a bead, a lion’s claw, a rag, or the like. This object is called the *Keti*, and is commonly worn about the person; and the more timid will sometimes have twenty or thirty hung about their necks. They are also addicted, from the same motive, to driving nails into trees and hanging rags upon them, the ghost being supposed to be conjured into the nails or rags.<sup>19</sup> Possibly this usage may throw light on a curious passage of the African Apuleius,

<sup>16</sup> Du Chaillu, xix.

<sup>17</sup> Homer, Od. xi. 96, 150.

<sup>18</sup> Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, xxiv. 162 (No. for March 1861).

<sup>19</sup> Burton, ii. 353.

when he speaks of the traveller's being delayed by "an altar garlanded with flowers, or a cavern overshadowed with leaves, or *an oak laden with horns, or a beech-tree crowned with hides*, or a hillock consecrated by a hedge, or the trunk of a tree chipped out by the hatchet, or a turf moistened with libations, or a stone drenched with unguent."<sup>20</sup>

The same superstition which Mr. Casalis mentions, of the dead being desirous to draw the living to themselves, was found by Dr. Livingstone widely diffused north of the Zambesi. "The spirits wish, as they imagine, to take the living away from the earth and all its enjoyments." The poor Africans may be said to have a great part of their time poisoned by these imaginary terrors, and live in fact like children who have been allowed to fill their minds with ghost-stories. The notion of the souls of murdered victims being hostile to those guilty of their death brings, indeed, occasionally a deserved retribution on the latter.

Some obscure traces are perhaps to be met with in Africa of the belief in the transmigration of souls. But it would be a great mistake to conclude, from such vague impressions, the existence of any kind of dogma. M. du Chaillu well says, that there is in the African mind no generalising; all is particular, isolated, fragmentary. A savage told him that the soul of a deceased friend was now occupying the body of a bird. Did he, then, believe in transmigration? The answer was, no. He had not thought of any thing but that single case, which perhaps some dream or casual fancy had suggested. It must also be recollected, in forming an opinion on African notions of transmigration, that nothing is more common, from Abyssinia down to the Cape, than the idea that certain persons can transform themselves into animals, a hyæna or a lion. Even the Bushmen have this belief. This is a different thing from the migration of the soul from one earthly tabernacle to another, but it may be all that is meant by instances where something similar is asserted of the dead. Perhaps the study of this curious aspect of the African mind may throw light hereafter on the ancient Egyptian view of transmigration. This is not the only point in which a connection may be traced between the African barbarism and the religion of old Egypt. A sort of rude animal worship is traceable in many quarters of savage Africa. Thus Dr. Livingstone tells us that the numerous tribes into which the Bechuanas are divided are named after different animals, *e. g.* Bakatla, "they of the monkey;" Bakuena, "they of the alligator;" Batlapi, "they of the fish;" and there are the names of extinct tribes remaining only in the

<sup>20</sup> Apul. Florid. i.



time of individual descendants, as Batén, "they of the lion;" Banóga, "they of the serpent." Each tribe, moreover, has a superstitious dread of the animal after which they are called, and will never eat their namesake. At Bonny, in Western Africa, Mr. Hutchinson witnessed a human sacrifice, at which, after the body had been devoured by the cannibals themselves, the intestines were given to an iguana, which was the object of their worship; and at New Kalabar human sacrifices are offered to a shark.<sup>21</sup> The Zulu Caffres imagine that their ancestors visit them in the form of serpents; they accordingly treat them with great respect, and place bowls of milk in their way. In Dahomey they worship the leopard, as the representative on earth of the supreme or invisible god "Séh." This animal is held by them as sacred, just as the cat, the crocodile, and other animals were in different districts of ancient Egypt, and whoever kills it is sacrificed to the offended deity. In a singular and horrible system of heathenism imported by the Negroes of Hayti from the Bight of Benin, the object of worship is a small green snake, called the Vaudoux. A high priest and priestess, called the Vaudoux king and queen, preside at the orgies celebrated in honour of this fetich, which are of a mystical and frightfully immoral kind.<sup>22</sup> In all this perhaps one may see fragments of some ancient religion, once common to the African races. Commander Forbes observes, with reference to the Dahoman mysteries, "Although different fetiches are as common as the changes of language in Central Africa, there is a perfect understanding among all fetich people. The priests of the worship of the leopard, the snake, and the shark, are all initiated into the same obscure form."<sup>23</sup>

I have already briefly noticed that remarkable functionary so well known among the African tribes by the title of the "medicine-man," or Mganga. The great extent of his influence may be judged of when we reflect on the immense predominance of the idea of witchcraft in the African mind. It is continually presenting itself, and there is no notion of sickness or death arising but from a violent cause. If a poor creature has the dropsy, some sorcerer must have lodged a fountain within his body. If a tumour exhibits itself, the spells of a sorcerer have introduced it. The moment a man imagines himself bewitched, he suspects every one, dreads his nearest relations, and loads himself with fetiches. Very probably he infects others with his fears; the village gets into a

<sup>21</sup> Hutchinson's *Ten Years' Wanderings among the Ethiopians*.

<sup>22</sup> Underhill's *West Indies*.

<sup>23</sup> Forbes, i. 173.

panic, and the Mganga must be sent for to find out the sorcerers who are at work. This personage arrives, with a whole arsenal of the weapons of his craft, selected generally for their rarity or foulness from vegetable and animal products, and institutes an investigation. The person accused by him has no appeal but to an ordeal,—an institution which is very widely diffused throughout Africa. In some parts it consists in drinking poison, as on the western coast; in dipping the hand in boiling water, as among the Wazarambo; or in putting a red-hot hatchet into the mouth of the accused, as in Usumbara. Those found guilty are burned alive; and massacres of this kind may proceed for a length of time, if a chief has a long illness. Most books of African travel contain long accounts of the hideous ceremonies with which the witch-finders appal the minds of their poor victims. It must not be understood that the Mganga answers merely to the notion of either “the white witch,” or “witch-finder,” of ages like that of James I. The Mganga is not incorrectly described by the usual term, “medicine-man,” but with the African every medicine is a charm. The medical art with them bears the same relation to its scientific character that astrology does to astronomy. Of course, these savage mediciners have learned by experience, amidst many absurdities, some natural and useful remedies. Their claims to the prediction of future events affecting the general interest of the tribe adds to the great power of which they are possessed. Failure in their attempted cures, or in their prophecies, does not generally undeceive their votaries; although so much is expected by the passionate temperament of the African, that even the Mganga himself is not always safe if he disappoints them. One instance happened of late years which must have strengthened their hold very greatly at the time. A famous medicine-man, named Omlangene, had told the Amakosas and Tembukis, Caffre tribes, that the sea would fight for them; and shortly after three hundred British troops were swallowed up in the wreck of the Birkenhead.<sup>24</sup>

Nations so dependent upon the fall of rain as the greater part of Africa south of the equator must be, in consequence of the strange desiccation that appears to have gone on, from not a remote epoch, throughout the country, must necessarily, if in the degraded condition I have described, be especially thrown on the arts of the Mganga, in reference to this primary need. The Italic nations of old had their magical remedies for the same purpose, called “*aquælicium*.”<sup>25</sup> The rain-maker of South Africa persuades his people that he can

<sup>24</sup> Casalis, p. 287.

<sup>25</sup> Festus, s. v. *Aquælicium*.



charm the clouds by burning preparations the names of which remind one of the witches' caldron in *Macbeth*,—charcoal made of bats, jackals' livers, baboons' and lions' hearts, hairy calculi from the bowels of old cows, serpents' skins, and such-like curiosities. The regions visited by M. du Chaillu were so abundantly supplied with rain that there was no occasion for rain-makers. But in some tribes there were medicine-men who professed to be able to stop the rains, by which they gained great credit in the rainy season. We are here reminded of another parallel to these wild forms of savage belief, in the practice of the remoter classical times. Plutarch mentions persons called *χαλαζοφύλακες*, or *hail-watchers*, whose business it was to watch the approach of hail, which they averted by means of the blood of a mole, or by rags,<sup>26</sup>—very probably used in some such way as the fetichists of Africa now practise. Travellers seem to be under the impression that the medicine-men themselves believe in their own powers. Dr. Livingstone relates a dialogue which he held with a rain-maker, so curious that we are tempted to quote a part of it. In reply to some observations of Dr. Livingstone's, to the effect that God alone could command the clouds, and that it was not by means of medicines that we were to pray to Him, the rain-maker replied: "God told us differently. He made black men first, and did not love us as He did the white men. He made you beautiful, and gave you clothing, and guns and gunpowder, and horses and wagons, and many other things about which we know nothing. But towards us He had no heart. He gave us nothing except the assegai, and cattle, and rain-making, and He did not give us hearts like yours. We never love each other. Other tribes place medicines about our country to prevent the rain, so that we may be dispersed by hunger, and go to them and augment their power. We must dissolve their charms by our medicines. God has given us one little thing which you know nothing of. He has given us the knowledge of certain medicines by which we can make rain. *We* do not despise those things which you possess, though we are ignorant of them. *You* ought not to despise our little knowledge, though you are ignorant of it."<sup>27</sup>

Circumcision is an ancient traditional institution which prevails very extensively in Africa. Among the Caffre tribes it is accompanied by some very remarkable customs, which remind one of parts of the ancient Spartan discipline. The Basutos administer this rite at the same time to a number

<sup>26</sup> Plutarch, *Sympos.* vii. qu. 2; cf. *Sen. Nat. Qu.* iv. 6, 7.

<sup>27</sup> Livingstone, p. 21.

of their youths, who are distributed into corporations, all those born about the same date being associated together, under the command of a chief of their own age. These youths are secluded for six or eight months previously, and subjected to great severities—scourging, fasting, lying in the cold season on the bare ground, and learning the rude science and poetry of the tribe. Such at least is the account given by Mr. Casalis.<sup>28</sup> A widely different and much less favourable view of the customs connected with circumcision among the Caffres is taken by Mr. Fleming, who describes a savage ceremonial lasting for thirty days, and accompanied with much vice and immorality.<sup>29</sup>

One more usage I may notice, as only discovered of late years, in the interior of Africa: I allude to the very singular institution which exists in Dahomey of a body of female soldiers, or Amazons, to the number of 5000, who form an important part of the king's army, conspicuous for their daring both in warfare and the chase. These women hold the rank of royal wives, but are said to live in strict chastity, carefully secluded from the rest of the army, and from the gaze of travellers when on the march. Commander Forbes, whilst he bears testimony to all this, ascribes the preservation of their honour, partly to the fact that extreme indulgence of one passion obliterates the sense of the rest, and that the Amazons, whilst indulging in the excitement of the most fearful cruelties, escape vices of a different kind, but partly to the influence of superstition, of the nature of which he gives very vague information.<sup>30</sup> The existence of this institution, on which light might perhaps be thrown by a study of some features in the ancient worship of Artemis, is another example of the manner in which fragmentary traces of older forms of paganism are found retained among the tribes of Africa.

The extent to which the institution of slavery has penetrated the tribes of Central Africa may be judged of from the fact which M. du Chaillu mentions, that, from the seashore to the farthest point of the interior he was able to reach, the commercial unit of value was a slave. As the Americans say dollar, as the English say pound sterling, so the Africans of those regions say slave. Fines are paid in slaves, wives are purchased for slaves; and if the buyer has no slaves, he pays as much of some other commodity as will represent the number of slaves required. The superstition of the barbarians acts in fostering this commerce, and again in modifying the character of slavery itself. The crime of witchcraft, on which

<sup>28</sup> Casalis, pp. 262-267.    <sup>29</sup> Fleming, pp. 286-89.    <sup>30</sup> Forbes, i. 133.



I have said so much, as influencing the whole of African social life, is punished by sale into slavery; a rule which must increase the frequency of those terrible accusations already rendering savage society so miserable. On the other hand, the same cause renders masters less severe with their slaves, for fear that the slaves will bewitch them.<sup>31</sup>

Such is M. du Chaillu's view of the matter. But Captain Burton, in speaking of domestic slaves on the eastern coast, says that "the slave is treated as one of the family, because the master's comfort depends upon the man's being contented."<sup>32</sup> And with this Mr. Petherick's testimony agrees for another tract of the country. The latter witness, in describing the Neam Nams, a tribe in the equatorial regions south of the White Nile, who employ slave-labour extensively in agriculture, some individuals owning them by hundreds, and in case of emergency taking them to battle, has the following observation: "As every where else in the interior of Africa within my knowledge, they were treated affectionately, and, generally speaking, both master and slave were proud of each other: in negro families I have often observed more attention paid to the slave than to their children. But I was assured both by free and slave negroes that a runaway slave belonging to the Neam Nams, if captured, was made an example of by being slain and devoured."<sup>33</sup>

The imported slaves on the eastern coast widely differ in character from the domestic slaves born in captivity, being very wild and perverse, and never thoroughly reclaimed. Yet even these seem to be treated with tolerable kindness, for they sometimes desert, and desertion is the loss of property. The tendency to desertion is indeed enough to show that slavery even in its gentler forms has no attraction for the human mind. That species of selfishness which protects the comfort of the slave lest the interest of the master should suffer, according to Captain Burton, has the effect of preventing the horrors of slave-driving in East Africa. Some merchants chain their gangs in traversing countries when desertion is frequent, but ordinarily trust rather to soft words and kind treatment, and take care not to overwork their "property." But he admits there are terrible exceptions to this general rule among a race which is reckless of human life. The evils of slavery are so numerous that it is difficult to compare them. But its general effect on the peace and happiness of the country is of a frightful kind. Kidnapping is one of the great causes of war throughout the savage tribes;

<sup>31</sup> Du Chaillu, xix.

<sup>32</sup> Burton, ii. 369.

<sup>33</sup> Petherick's Egypt, the Soudan and Central Africa, p. 468.

and villages of people living in tolerable comfort are liable at any moment to be swept away by marauding races of superior strength. Whole districts are made desolate, and the inhabitants carried off to remote regions, or in the end transferred to the horrors of the slave-ship.

There are two classes of slaves, found alike by M. du Chaillu in the west and Captain Burton in the east,—domestic slaves and those captured for exportation. In western equatorial Africa, the former are perhaps rather to be regarded as serfs, or *coloni*, since they are not sold out of the tribe, and may hold property of their own; their principal duty being to furnish their master with food, either by tillage or the chase. In some parts of the west, the institution mixes itself up most singularly with the framework of society, the slave frequently marrying the daughter of his master, and the right of succession belonging to their son, who thus may become the owner of his own father. And in the same countries (about the Bight of Biafre, as also on the Gold Coast), a custom exists that reminds one of the old Roman *nexum*.<sup>34</sup> Persons are pawned in liquidation of debts, native merchants leaving slaves in payment for goods. These “pawns,” as they are called, are treated exactly like slaves, but may not be sold out of the country. Domestic slavery in Africa exhibits one of the features which was common in a system as widely removed from it as Russian serfdom. Masters trust slaves to make long commercial expeditions into the interior, and they are generally found faithful to their trust. It seems difficult to imagine any cause which, whilst Africans remain in their present social state, can remove from that continent the curse of slavery. For although it is true that the extinction of the foreign slave-trade would remove one great temptation to the enslavement of the weaker tribes by the stronger, and would give a great stimulus to the production of palm-oil and other commodities, by which the coveted and too scantily-supplied objects of European commerce could be purchased, yet the same cause would probably increase predial servitude, in proportion to the augmentation of the native demand for agricultural labour, tending no doubt gradually to the civilisation of the country.<sup>35</sup>

The part which is destined for Africa in the remote future of human history is hard to conjecture. Hitherto its place has uniformly been such as to verify the tradition that its people have laboured under a primitive curse, age after age beholding them as unchanged in their poor and low approaches

<sup>34</sup> Hutchinson, *Ten Years, &c.*, and Forbes, i. 149.

<sup>35</sup> Du Chaillu, xix. 333, and Burton, ii. 377.



to improvement as the lower animals are in instinct. But we cannot suppose it without meaning, that in this age, when the whole earth seems coming within the grasp and cognisance of the most highly civilised races, Africa too is ceasing to be that "fiery yet gloomy" land it has been, a blank in the world's atlas, shrouded from all clear knowledge of Europeans beyond a few miles of the coast. The lines of the successful discoverer begin to traverse it in all directions, and distinct conceptions may now be made of the tribes occupying very large tracts hitherto quite unknown. Nothing shows them to be incapable of improvement, for every barbarous usage they practise has its parallel in the infancy of the greatest races; whilst there is this marked distinction between them and savage tribes in many other parts of the world, that they show no signs of dwindling away under the contact of civilisation. It is true that many tribes have disappeared, but rather by collision with more powerful branches of the same race, by exterminating wars, and by kidnapping, than as the Australians or Americans have melted away under the sinister proximity of the Anglo-Saxons. It is said that the Caffres, on the contrary, have even increased since the arrival of Europeans. And low in the scale of humanity as most of the African races are, they nevertheless possess, in a high degree, the commercial propensity which has done so much for the material advancement of mankind, and to the absence of which in barbarians in many respects much more attractive,—those, for example, of North America,—must be attributed that incapacity which they show for substituting any higher form of civilisation for their own. The Negro is undoubtedly in the position of an infant as compared with the European; but we have no right to assume that that infancy is to be permanent because it has lasted for thousands of years; a principle which would have led political reasoners of the age of Tacitus to predict that Providence had no future in store for the great Germanic race.

---

## SECRET HISTORY OF CHARLES II.

[COMMUNICATED.]

IN the register of the house of novices of the Jesuits at Rome there is the following entry : *Jacobus de la Cloche ingressus 11 Aprilis 1668*. From another list, which is signed by the novice himself, we learn that he came from the island of Jersey, and was a subject of the King of England ; that his age was about twenty-four ; and that he presented himself for admission in the dress of an ecclesiastic, with scarcely any luggage but the clothes he wore. This youth, whose name occurs no more in the books of the order, and has never yet been pronounced by history, was the eldest of the sons of Charles the Second,—the elder brother of Monmouth, and destined to be for a moment his rival in the fanciful schemes of his father. So well was the secret of his birth preserved, that throughout the long intrigue to save the Protestant succession, and to supplant the Duke of York by the son of Lucy Walters, no man ever discovered that there was another who, by his age and by his mother's rank, had a better claim than the popular favourite, and who had voluntarily renounced the dazzling fortunes which were once within his grasp. The obscurity which he preferred has endured for nearly 200 years, and even now is not entirely dispelled ; but the facts which I have to relate add a new and interesting episode to the chequered history of the Stuarts, and clear up whatever remained uncertain as to the attachment of Charles II. to the Catholic Church.

This attachment, which excited so keenly the curiosity of the world, and influenced so many of the actions of his reign, has been admitted with greater unanimity by recent historians than by those who spoke from personal observation, and whom Charles succeeded in partially misleading. "It was not," says the ablest of the statesmen who approached him, "the least skilful part of his concealing himself, to make the world think he leaned towards an indifference in religion."<sup>1</sup> That belief was long since found to be untenable. Mr. Fox, and the author of the *Annals of England*, believe that he had been actually reconciled to the Catholic Church ; and Mackintosh fixes the date of that event in the year 1658. Hallam justly rejects this opinion, but is certain that the King had imbibed during the period of his banishment a persuasion, that if any scheme of Christianity was true, it could only be found in the bosom of an infallible Church. Dr. Vaughan believes that, so far as he could

<sup>1</sup> Halifax, *Character of Charles II.*, p. 11.



be said to have any religion, he was a Catholic; and Macaulay exactly agrees with Dr. Vaughan. Lingard, who declares his early professions of regard for Catholicism a pretence, supplies no psychological explanation of the discrepancy between the scene at his death and his previous insincerity; while Dod more reasonably considers the reconciliation at the last moment a proof that he had inwardly espoused the Catholic doctrines before.

Many things contributed during the life of Charles to spread and to keep alive the report of his conversion. His mother's sincerity and zeal in religion were well known. She had attempted to instil the sentiments of her faith into her eldest daughter Mary, afterwards Princess of Orange, and although this was prevented by the King, she obtained his consent in her exile that their youngest child Henrietta should be educated a Catholic. At Paris Henrietta Maria exerted herself to induce the Duke of Gloucester to change his religion; and when the exhortations of Charles, the influence of Ormond, and the memory of the last solemn parting with his father prevailed against her efforts, she drove him from her presence. Charles I. had feared that the religion of his queen would injure the cause of his son, and sent earnest warnings to both when the Prince joined his mother in France. To the former he wrote from Oxford, 22d March 1646: "I command you, upon my blessing, to be constant to your religion; neither hearkening to Roman superstitions, nor the seditions and schismatical doctrines of the Presbyterians and Independents; for know that a persecuted church is not thereby less pure, though less fortunate. For all other things I command you to be totally directed by your mother."<sup>2</sup> Shortly after, he wrote to the Queen from Newcastle: "In God's name, let him stay with thee till it is seen what ply my business will take; and, for my sake, let the world see that the Queen seeks not to alter his conscience."<sup>3</sup> Clarendon entertained the same fears, and endeavoured to keep the Prince at Jersey, away from his mother's influence. But he bears testimony that, for six years, down to 1652, when the fortunes of the Stuarts seemed desperate, and the motives for prudence had disappeared with the hope of success, Henrietta Maria was sensible of the impolicy of a step which, more than any other act, must have alienated the English people from their king.<sup>4</sup> That she recognised it at first we may conclude, from the failure of the match between Charles and Mademoiselle de Montpensier, the cousin of Lewis XIV. That princess insisted that the difference of religion was an insurmountable obstacle; and Jermyn,

<sup>2</sup> Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, x. 8

<sup>3</sup> Clarendon Papers, ii. 239.

<sup>4</sup> *History*, xiii. 131.

who was conducting the business, and must have spoken the thoughts of the Queen-mother, thereupon replied that the King could not change his religion for her sake without forfeiting for ever the crown of his kingdom.<sup>5</sup>

When, at length, it appeared certain that no chance of recovering the throne remained, except through the support of the Catholic powers, the exiled courtiers began to debate whether some sacrifice might not be made for the purpose of obtaining their assistance. "The Protestant religion was found to be very unagreeable to their fortune, and very many exercised their thoughts most how to get handsomely from it . . . . Many made little doubt but that it would shortly be very manifest to the King that his restoration depended wholly upon a conjunction of Catholic princes, who could never be united but on the behalf of Catholic religion."<sup>6</sup> Digby, Clifford, and Bennet became Catholics, and proved their sincerity at their deaths; but they all agreed that it would be dangerous for Charles to imitate them. Clarendon, whose purpose it was to divert from his master the suspicion of popery, wished it to be believed that no religious scruples, no doubts in the orthodoxy of the Anglican Church, had ever invaded the exiled court, and that the Catholic inclinations or professions of some of its members were the effects of political design. He had argued with great force, that even though Charles should give no cause for suspicion, the fact of his residence in a Catholic country would be a pretext for his enemies to accuse him. It would not be hard, he wrote to Jermyn, to persuade them who believed the King a papist, when he was seen every day at Church in England, to believe the Prince a papist when he had no church in France to go to.<sup>7</sup> But the other advisers, who were less sturdy Protestants than the Chancellor, knew that nothing was to be expected for their cause from a change of religion. In the period of the administration of Mazarin, and the peace of Westphalia, no reasonable man could believe that any state would incur the expense and the risk of war for the establishment of a Catholic dynasty in England; and even those who believed that Charles leaned from conviction towards Rome, and whose sympathies were on the same side, were careful to conceal the fact.<sup>8</sup> A rumour reached their friends in England, and caused an extreme alarm. "There is a report," wrote Mordaunt to Ormond, in November 1659,

<sup>5</sup> *Mémoires de Mademoiselle*, p. 57, ed. Michaud.

<sup>6</sup> Clarendon, xvi. 74.

<sup>7</sup> Lister, *Life of Clarendon*, i. 284. He would not allow the Prince to attend the service of the French Calvinists at Charenton (*History*, xiii. 133).

<sup>8</sup> The testimony of Ormond and Burnet, and the worthless reports to the same effect in Kennet and Echard, are collected in the *Biographia Britannica*, ii. 177 D, 2d ed.



"so hot of your master's being turned Papist, that unless it be suddenly contradicted, and the world disabused by something coming expressly from him, it is likely, in this extraordinary conjuncture, to do him very great injury amongst his friends both in city and country, in both which his constancy all this while hath rendered him many considerable proselytes."<sup>9</sup> This letter justly represents the position of affairs, and the state of public feeling; and Clarendon took his measures to undeceive his party and to silence their enemies.

Yet, although political interest forbade a public declaration, there was truth in the reports circulated in England, and so stoutly contradicted by the royalists. It is certain that Charles had, during the last years of his exile, secretly adopted the Catholic faith, although the fear of detection prevented a formal abjuration of Protestantism. Burnet says he was received before he left Paris, and that Cardinal de Retz and Aubigny had a hand in it. This information he had obtained from two sources, and indirectly, he affirms, from Retz himself. When Charles was at Paris, after the flight from Worcester, he received instruction in religion from Olier, the celebrated founder of the seminary of St. Sulpice. His conferences were no secret, for Olier had informed his friends of his hopes, and entreated their prayers. They probably gave occasion to the exaggerated report of Burnet. Charles, it is true, wrote from Paris to the Pope to ask for assistance in recovering his dominions. Innocent would have been satisfied, under the circumstances, with a private abjuration; but this was refused, and the King could not even obtain an answer to his application.<sup>10</sup> But although he was not received into the Church, he had advanced so far in his opinions that he might, as Thurloe affirmed, in his communications with the Spanish government, have declared himself in private to them to be a Catholic.<sup>11</sup> Neither France nor Spain had any inducement to publish what would diminish the chances of monarchy in England, and strengthen a government they feared and hated. The story that Ormond discovered Charles on his knees hearing mass in a church at Brussels comes to us through two independent channels, Carte and Echard. The latter supposes the ceremony of abjuration to have occurred when the King was at Fuentarabia, at the time of the treaty of the Pyrenees. There is much reason in a remark which is made by Welwood: "The truth is, King Charles was neither bigot enough to any religion, nor loved his ease so little, as to embark in a business that must at least have disturbed his quiet, if not hazarded his crown."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Carte's Collection, ii. 264.

<sup>10</sup> Vie de M. Olier, ii. 489. From the French Archives.

<sup>11</sup> Carte, ii. 102.

<sup>12</sup> Memoirs, p. 131.

Ludovick Stuart, Lord Aubigny, to whom Burnet attributes the conversion of Charles, appeared at Whitehall immediately after the Restoration. In France, where he was educated and ordained, he had joined the party of Cardinal de Retz and the Jansenists, and had been made a canon of Notre Dame. As a relative of the royal family, and at one time an inmate of St. Sulpice, he was probably aware of the conferences which Olier, and perhaps others,<sup>13</sup> held with Charles during his residence at Paris. In April 1661, he officiated at the private marriage of Charles with Catherine of Braganza, and became almoner to the Queen. His royal descent, and the position he had already attained in the Church, pointed him out as a suitable person to conduct the projected intercourse between the English court and the Holy See. In order to obtain that office, he sought the aid of a more powerful negotiator.

His friend Cardinal de Retz had taken the foremost part in the troubles which distracted both Church and State in France in the days of the Fronde, and after balancing for a season the power of Mazarin, had been deserted by fortune, and suffered in banishment the disgrace both of the French and of the Roman court. Upon the death of Cromwell, Ormond had recourse to him in the name of the king, who promised, if the Cardinal would obtain for him some assistance from the Pope, to protect the Catholics after his restoration. Retz, hoping that the merit of having secured a promise of indulgence for the Catholic subjects of the King of England would powerfully assist his own cause, undertook the negotiation, and sent one of his adherents, the Abbé Charier, to Rome. The envoy could not, however, obtain an audience of the Pope; and he was assured by one of the Cardinals that the promises of Charles had made no impression, and that the prospect of relief to the oppressed Catholics would never induce Alexander VII. to furnish him with money.<sup>14</sup> The Restoration soon altered the position of affairs, and improved the prospects of the Cardinal. He came to London in 1660, and received not only promises of support from the King, but large sums of money, on condition that he would promote the objects which Charles was pursuing in the court of Rome. These objects were of such importance that the notion of a marriage with one of the nieces of Mazarin was entertained for a moment by Charles as a means of securing them,<sup>15</sup> and was eagerly

<sup>13</sup> Charles is reported to have said that though many persons had dis-coursed with him on religion, none had affected him so much as Olier. *Vie de M. Olier*, ii. 490.

<sup>14</sup> *Mémoires de Guy Joly*, p. 140, ed. Michaud.

<sup>15</sup> "Aujourd'hui la reine a reçu une lettre du roy son fils, où il parle positivement, et dit qu'après avoir considéré toutes les raisons de son mariage, il se conformoit à son sentiment pour vostre nièce, en vue du grand dessein à



adopted by Retz, for the purpose of recovering his favour at Paris. Mazarin despatched a special envoy to England charged with the mission of promoting the match. He found an auxiliary in Aubigny, who represented to Charles the beauty of the Cardinal's nieces, but more particularly their virtue, of which, says the envoy, the King was much pleased to hear. Together with this futile intrigue Retz was pleading at Whitehall for the Catholics, and at Rome for the settlement of that important affair to which the alliance with Mazarin and the elevation of Aubigny were expected to contribute. The first of these subsidiary negotiations was speedily abandoned; the other was pursued with a strange pertinacity for several years.

At first Charles desired a mitre for his kinsman,<sup>16</sup> but he soon raised his demands, and insisted on having him created a cardinal. Clarendon, who was ignorant of the real design of which this was to be the prelude, entered into the idea, and drew up the instructions with which, in October 1662, the Queen's secretary, Sir Richard Bellings, was sent to Rome. In the following year the Chancellor's share in these transactions was made a part of the abortive charge preferred against him by Bristol; and it appears from the articles that the great importance which was given to this negotiation, and the correspondence with the Roman cardinals, were generally known at the time. Retz advised Charles to secure the compliance of the Pope by sending a squadron to cruise off Civit  Vecchia, and then proceeded to Hamburg to obtain the powerful intervention of the Queen of Sweden. He was charged at the same time with the distribution of a sum of fifteen thousand pounds, which Charles had determined to devote to the interests of Aubigny.<sup>17</sup> Letters were written by both the queens of England to Cardinal Orsini, Protector of Portugal, urging him to press the suit, and assuring him that if the promotion should be refused, lamentable consequences might be apprehended from the disappointment of the King. Orsini, after an interview with Bellings, warmly took up the cause, and declared in a letter to the famous Cardinal Pallavicini, that he might, by assisting him, render a great service to religion. They also wrote to the two most influential men in Rome, Cardinals Chigi and Azzolini, the latter of whom was an active promoter of the design. His letter to the King, of April 8, 1663, advising the continuation of his efforts, and that of Cardinal Chigi, written on the following day, are in the State-Paper Office.<sup>18</sup>

quoi il estoit port  de jour en jour avec plus de faveur." Lionne to Mazarin, 7 July 1660,—in Champollion, *Compl ment des M moires de Retz*, p. 589, ed. Michaud.

<sup>16</sup> Dod, *Church History of England*, iii. 239.

<sup>17</sup> *M moires de Guy Joly*, p. 149.

<sup>18</sup> *Italian States*, bundle no. 24.

The question was maturely debated at Rome, and an opinion was drawn up in favour of Aubigny, founded partly on the statements of Bellings, and partly on the elaborate memorials of Retz, in which the services of the King were set forth. This opinion was to the following effect: The Restoration had improved the condition of the Catholics, and whatever relief they enjoyed was due to the influence of Charles himself, and was disliked by the Parliament and the country. The abolition of the penal laws could not be expected, for the royal authority was competent only to suspend them. Indeed, it might be considered almost more advantageous, under the circumstances, that the laws should be suspended than toleration proclaimed. For the same disabilities from which the Catholics suffered extended in great part to the Presbyterians, and the other sects who were hostile to the monarchy. They could not therefore be abrogated without depriving the King of the weapons the law gave him to defend the crown against the Nonconformists, while a partial abolition would excite fresh envy against the Catholics, and add to the number of their enemies. Legislative toleration, inasmuch as its benefits would be shared by the Dissenters, was not to be desired, even if it could be obtained. It was necessary to rely solely on the power and the favour of the King. For his authority might be trusted not only as a security against the heretics, but also against that portion of the Catholics who were in opposition to the Jesuits. To his salutary influence was to be attributed the suppression of the measure for Catholic relief which had been brought forward in July 1662, in answer to the petition presented by that party, who had offered to swear that they did not hold the doctrine of the temporal authority of the Holy See, and that they would "oppose with their lives and fortunes the Pontiff himself, if he should ever attempt to execute that pretended power."<sup>19</sup> Again, when the Irish protestation of allegiance, which many leading Catholics had signed, was found in like manner to be very far removed from the obedience due to the Apostolic See, Charles had refused to countenance it, and had exhibited an unvarying respect for the Pope. Queen Henrietta Maria, who was now supporting the cause of Aubigny, had formerly obtained the same dignity for Conne, and only his death had prevented him from enjoying it. The state of the Catholics was more satisfactory and more hopeful than when the favour now asked for had been granted before, and the new King had in several ways shown that he was favourably disposed. Before leaving the Low Countries to ascend his throne, he had sent a rich present to the English nuns at Ghent. He had given audience to several Jesuits, and among others to two successive

<sup>19</sup> Lingard, ix. 35.



provincials, to whom he had promised his protection in case of need. He had been seen in a posture of adoration at high mass in the Queen's chapel.

These were the views at that time entertained at Rome concerning the religious character of Charles II., and the arguments advanced in support of the promotion of Aubigny. Nevertheless the demand was rejected. The Pope's answer was conveyed in such terms that Charles was not offended, and accepted the explanation. The refusal, indeed, was only temporary. The solicitations of the English court were soon after renewed, and they were at last successful. In November 1665, Aubigny, who was then at Paris, received his nomination, and died almost immediately after.<sup>20</sup> His name does not appear in the list of the cardinals created by Alexander VII., but his elevation and the influence by which it had been obtained were known, and had excited hopes for the Catholic Church in this country, which caused his death to be regarded as a serious calamity. The general of the Jesuits, on hearing of it, wrote to one of his correspondents: "The clouds which are gathering over Holland, Poland, and Constantinople are so dense, that every prudent man must see reason to apprehend enormous catastrophes, and storms that will not be ended without irreparable disasters. But in my mind all these coming evils are overshadowed by the death of the Abbé Aubigny, which deprives the Church, for a time at least, of the joy of beholding an English cardinal of such illustrious blood, created at the public instances of two queens, and at the secret request of a king: a prodigy which would without doubt have confounded heresy, and inaugurated bright fortunes to the unhappy Catholics."

The affair of the cardinal's hat was not the principal object of the mission of Sir Richard Bellings. It was intended as a preliminary to that more important negotiation which the envoy was instructed to reserve if the first should fail, and which inspired Queen Catherine with so much anxiety, and Cardinal Orsini with such sanguine hopes of the advancement of religion. The two queens knew that Charles was at heart a Catholic, and they pressed him to declare himself. He was now firmly seated on his throne; the Established Church had recovered its supremacy, and was not only profoundly loyal, but still strongly impregnated with those Catholic tendencies which had hastened its fall; the Puritans and Independents were yet prostrate beneath the ruins of their political system, and the great body that revered Baxter as their chief was comparatively tolerant. Charles, believing that the step, which would have prevented his return,

<sup>20</sup> Moréri, *Dictionnaire Historique*, ix. 597. His epitaph in Douglas, *Peerage of Scotland*, ii. 101.

might now be taken without involving the risk of a new revolution, resolved to feel his way towards a reconciliation with the Holy See. In addition to the instructions drawn up by Clarendon, Sir Richard Bellings carried to Rome proposals for the submission of the three kingdoms to the Church, and presented to Alexander VII. the King's profession of faith.<sup>21</sup> Charles declared that he was willing to accept the creed of Pius IV., the decrees of the Council of Trent and of all general Councils on faith and morals, and the decisions of the two last Pontiffs in the affair of the Jansenists; saving the particular rights and customs of the nation, as is the practice in France and in other countries; and provided always no new laws should be imposed upon his realm, and he should be free to complete in his own way the work of reconciliation. He declared that he renounced and detested all the heresies which had involved his country in ecclesiastical and civil troubles, and made England the most distracted state in the world. He undertook to restore the hierarchy as it was under Henry VIII.; and added that the Protestants should have toleration as long as they did not disturb the peace.

In this very remarkable document, Charles, who believed that many of his subjects would follow his example, gave one of the earliest instances of what has since been constantly witnessed,—that princes who, as head of the Protestant Church in their dominions, enjoy an almost unlimited authority, cannot view without jealousy the ecclesiastical liberty which is claimed by Catholicism. He carefully restricted the papal jurisdiction both of doctrine and discipline, and reserved to himself the rights which the Gallican system attributed to the secular power. He even proposed that the Church should abandon her essential function of judging and defining matters of faith as occasion should arise. Although this is a condition contrary to the nature of the Catholic Church, the document proposing it, which is followed by twenty-four articles on particular points, exhibits so much familiarity with ecclesiastical forms that it must have been drawn up by a Catholic hand. It is not probable that many persons were admitted on this occasion into the confidence of Charles. The whole scheme was not discussed beyond the door of the royal closet. It betrays the hand of a layman, for no priest could have expected the Church to discontinue her dogmatic progress; and Aubigny, the only priest likely to be consulted, was not likely to introduce the clause against Jansenism. Now we know that the secret was im-

<sup>21</sup> Oblatio ex parte Caroli II. Magnæ Britanniae Regis pro optatissima trium suorum Regnorum Angliæ, Scotiæ et Hiberniæ cum Sede Apostolica Romana reunione.



parted to one lay Catholic, the agent who was charged with the negotiation. No man was more likely to be chosen for that important mission than he to whom the affair had been confided from the first, or could discuss the proposals better than he who had helped to devise them. Bellings was a man of note and distinction among the Catholics in both islands, and was often employed by the court in confidential missions. His father had been one of the leaders in the opposition to the nuncio Rinuccini, and was the author of that protestation of allegiance which had been adopted by a large party in Ireland, and which was so badly received at Rome. The son was, therefore, not unlikely to suggest those limitations of ecclesiastical authority which he undertook to defend, and which corresponded with the views of his father and of those who, in the language of Bristol, were Catholics of the Church of Rome, not of the court of Rome.

The answer of Alexander was probably not very encouraging, for the negotiation was broken off. A suspicion was awakened that the king was in correspondence with the Pope, and Charles, in his alarm, took measures to prove his aversion of Catholicism. He opened Parliament on the 18th of February 1663, with a demand for new laws to restrain the progress of Popery, and gave his assent to a proclamation ordering all priests to quit the kingdom under pain of death. He explained, five years later, in a letter to which I shall presently return, the failure of his negotiation, and the inconsistency of his subsequent conduct. "*Quoyqu'elle nous fust présentée avec toutes les circonstances nécessaires, et par personne catholique, toutefois ce ne peut estre avec tant de prudence que nous ne fussions soupçonnés d'intelligence avec le pape par les plus clairvoyants de nostre cour ; mais ayant trouvé le moyen d'étouffer le soubçon que l'on començoit d'avoir que nous fussions catholique, nous fusmes obligé, crainte de ne le faire renaistre dans les esprits, de consentir aux occasions a plusieurs choses tournant au desavantage de plusieurs catholiques de nostre royaume d'Hybernie, ce qui est cause encore que bien que nous eussions escry assez secrettement à sa sainteté pour nostre rangement à l'église catholique, au mesme temps que nous prions sa sainteté de faire cardinal nostre très cher cousin le Milord d'Aubigny, dont nous fumes refusés pour bonnes raisons, nous n'avons peu pour-suyvre nostre pointe.*" The scheme was not resumed for several years. Times were not propitious. The Dutch war, the Plague, the Fire, the Triple Alliance, intervened. Public animosity was inflamed against the Catholics ; and Charles had no confidential agent whom he could employ without danger to propose, if not the reconciliation of the country, for which he was not dis-

posed to make great efforts or great sacrifices, at least his own submission to the Catholic Church. During this interval, Jacques de la Cloche made his appearance for the first time in England.

In the spring of 1646, during his first residence in Jersey, Charles fell in love with a young lady of high rank, who became the mother of a child, who enjoyed the prerogative denied to all the other natural children of the king, of bearing his father's name. He was called James Stuart, and was brought up in the Protestant religion on the Continent. "Il nous est né lorsque nous n'avions guères plus de seize ou 17 ans, d'une jeune dame des plus qualifiées de nos royaumes, plustost par fragilité de nostre première jeunesse que par malice." The last words appear to indicate Charles's respect for the mother, and the care with which he protected her fame. Unlike the Clevelands and Portsmouths who afterwards disgraced his court, the lady who was the object of his earliest attachment obtained of her royal lover the concealment of her fault, and her name has never been divulged. She is nowhere mentioned in the correspondence relating to her son; and if she died before his arrival in England, the reputation of her family may have induced the King to conceal his birth. After the Restoration he allowed him to remain abroad unnoticed, and under the disguise of an assumed name, until the year 1665. In that year he sent for him to England, supplied him with money, and gave him a certificate in which he recognised him as his son, but which he commanded him to show to nobody whilst his father lived. This document, written and signed by Charles's own hand, and sealed with his private seal, is dated Whitehall, 27 September 1665, —a time at which the plague was at its height, and the court was not in London. For greater security, he obliged his son once more to change his name. That which he had borne till then is not known. He was now called James de la Cloche du Bourg. It is not easy to say whether the last of these names may afford some clue to the discovery of his mother's family among the three thousand royalists who took refuge in Jersey at the same time as the Prince of Wales.<sup>22</sup> The former name had been made popular in that island when Charles arrived there, by the spirit with which Mr. de la Cloche, a clergyman, had resisted the authority of government.<sup>23</sup> After lying nearly a year in prison, he was released upon the arrival of the Prince, and then left the island. Had his release any thing to do with Charles's private affairs? Was the boy christened by him, or afterwards committed to his charge?

<sup>22</sup> R. Augier to the Speaker,—in Cary, *Memorials of the Civil War*, i. 7.

<sup>23</sup> Le Quesne, *Constitutional History of Jersey*, p. 325.



James was unwilling to remain in England. It was not his country; he did not speak the language; he had no career and no recognised station; and his position was not to his taste. He had made great proficiency in his studies abroad, and he desired to continue them in the Dutch universities. His father did not know what to do with him in England, and allowed him to go. Eighteen months later, on the 7th of February 1667, he sent him another document, recognising his birth, and directing his successor to give him 500*l.* a year. A condition was attached to the grant of this pension, that it could be enjoyed only while the claimant resided in London, and remained faithful to the religion of his fathers and to the Anglican liturgy. Six months after receiving this letter, on the 29th of July 1667, James Stuart became a Catholic at Hamburg.

The Queen of Sweden, who filled Europe with the fame of her abdication, her abjuration, her talents, and her eccentricities, was for the second time residing at Hamburg, and appears again on the scene of the secret history of Charles. She signed a paper for his son, certifying that he had been received into the Church at that particular place and time, in order that he might be able, in case of need, to satisfy his confessor of the identity of the convert of Hamburg with the Protestant whom the King of Great Britain had privately recognised as his son. This was now necessary; because he had determined, immediately after his conversion, to enter the novitiate of the Jesuits. Christine knew who he was, probably, because he had been compelled to apply to her chaplains, or at least for her protection, in order to be received. The Senate of Hamburg exercised with extreme severity the right which the Treaties of Westphalia gave to each government of exacting religious conformity; and the neighbouring town of Altona, peopled by the Catholics, Anabaptists, and Jews whom the Lutherans had expelled, grew up a monument of the intolerance of the Free City. The Queen had attempted, some years before, to obtain freedom of conscience for her own religion, through the intervention of the Catholic powers; but the Emperor, whose rights were derived from the same treaty by which the senate justified its rigour, and who was not disposed to surrender them, refused to disturb the settlement of Munster. At the very time when James was converted, the town had been thrown into confusion by the uproar caused by a fête which Christine gave, in the midst of a Protestant population, to celebrate the election of Clement IX. Charles was much annoyed to learn that she was in his son's confidence. "She is prudent and wise," he said; "but she is a woman, and that is enough to make us doubt whether she is able to keep a secret."

James de la Cloche was hardly settled at Rome when his father determined to have him about his court. That vast intrigue had just commenced which was to raise France to the pinnacle of power, and which, by a timely subservience, promised to emancipate the princes of the House of Stuart from the control of Parliament, and from the terrors which had postponed the King's design of reconciliation with Rome. In that conspiracy the motives of religious belief and political ambition were strangely blended. Turenne, who was destined to be the foremost actor in the execution of the design, was a sincere Calvinist. He had shortly before refused the great dignity of Constable of France, when it was tendered as the reward of his conversion. On the 23d of October 1668 Turenne became a Catholic. He was shortly after followed by his old lieutenant, a confederate in the new scheme, the Duke of York. James had applied to the Provincial of the Jesuits, and then to the Pope, for permission to conceal his religion; and had been told that it was impossible. With this answer he caught the conscience of the king. On the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul 1669, Charles summoned his Catholic counsellors, declared with tears how uneasy he was not to profess the faith which he believed, and consulted them as to the best mode of carrying out his resolution. They concluded that the only way was to do it in conjunction with France.<sup>24</sup> A few months before this resolution was finally taken, in August 1668, Charles had written to the General of the Jesuits to send him his son, whose presence he needed for the good of his soul.

He had long sought in vain, the King said to Oliva, for a person with whom he could confer on spiritual matters without creating suspicion. The priests who lived in London were so well known that no disguise could conceal them;<sup>25</sup> but the conversion of his son, and his entrance into orders, at length gave him an opportunity of receiving the sacraments without alarming the Protestant zeal of his subjects. His son might remain unknown, as the Queens alone were aware of his existence; but before long he should be publicly acknowledged. "*Plusieurs raisons considérables, et concernant la paix de nos royaumes, nous ont empesché iusques à présent de le reconnestre publiquement pour notre fils; mais ce sera pour peu de temps, parceque nous sommes maintenant en dessein de faire en sorte de le reconnestre publiquement devant peu d'années.*" In case he was not a priest, and could not be ordained before starting, Charles directed that he should go to Paris, and address himself either to

<sup>24</sup> Clarke, *Life of James II.*, i. 441.

<sup>25</sup> We know, from the account of his death, that none of the Portuguese chaplains of the Queen could speak either English or French.



the King or to the Duchess of Orleans, who knew of his own design, and would have James ordained without betraying his rank; or, if he preferred it, the two Queens would find an opportunity for his ordination in England. As soon as he had received his father into the Church, he would be free either to return to Rome, or to live in England, so as to be within call, but not in London, lest people should suspect that the King's son was a Jesuit. This was written on the 3d of August. On the 29th, Charles, having heard that the Queen of Sweden was on her way to Rome, wrote again to hasten the departure of his son; for he feared that Christine, if she saw him, would discover the purpose of his intended journey. If that should become known in England, he said, it would infallibly cost him his life. He therefore desired that his son, instead of stopping at Paris, should come with all speed to London, and there make himself known to the Queen-mother by delivering to her a sealed letter in the form of a petition. This letter was scarcely sealed, when he wrote a third time to the General. It had occurred to his mother and his wife that a novice is not allowed among the Jesuits to travel alone. Charles hoped that this regulation would be dispensed with, and that his son would be permitted to set out by himself in the dress of a layman. Secret warning had already been given at the southern ports that a foreign prince, whose appearance was described as near that of James as possible, was about to seek refuge in England, and would arrive without any companion. The presence of a Jesuit father would have spoilt this plan. The better to meet the arrangements which had been made, the novice was to call himself Henry de Rohan, a name well known as that of one of the great Huguenot families of France. Charles declared on his royal word, *en foy de roy*, that the sole object of his letters was the salvation of his soul, and the good of his son and of the order, and that he would either induce the Pope to make him a cardinal, or allow him, if he should prefer it, to remain a simple religious.

In the middle of October 1668 the young ecclesiastic started for England, disguised as a French cavalier. Together with his letters to Oliva, Charles had written to him in terms of the warmest affection. The temper of Parliament, he said, had hitherto made it necessary to defer the public acknowledgment of his birth, but the time was approaching when it would be possible for him to assume the rank which belonged to him. It behoved him therefore to reflect maturely on his altered prospects, before entering irrevocably into sacred orders. His title was better than that of the Duke of Monmouth, and he had a right of precedence over him, "*par toutes raisons, et à cause de la qualité de une mère.*" The Queen was childless, and

the children of the Duke of York were delicate; and if the Catholic religion should be restored in England he would have a claim to the crown. "Nous pouvons vous assurer que si Dieu permet que nous et notre très honoré frère le duc d'York mourons sans enfans, les royaumes vous appartient, et le parlement ne peut pas légitimement s'y opposer; si ce n'est qu'en matière d'estre catholique vous en soyez exclus. . . . Croyez que nous vous avons toujours en une affection particulière non seulement à cause que vous nous este né dans nostre plus tendre ieunesse, lorsque nous n'avions guères plus de 16 ou 17 ans, que particulièrement à cause de l'excellent naturel que nous avons toujours remarqué en vous."

Prince James Stuart, as the King now calls him, remained scarcely a fortnight in England. On the 18th of November he was sent back to Rome on a secret mission to the General of the Jesuits, with directions to return as soon as he had obtained what the King desired. It does not appear what that was. It is probable that Charles wished, like his brother, to be allowed to keep his change of religion a secret; and the application which James says that he made to the Pope at this time may have been conveyed, on the part of both brothers, by the youth whom Charles had already selected to be the medium of communication with the Holy See. The Duke of York's letter to the Pope required secrecy, and we know that no messenger was trusted by Charles but the young Stuart himself. This was not, however, the only condition he desired to exact in making his submission to the Holy See. We have seen the tenor of his demands in 1662. In his letters to his sister, published by Dalrymple, he mentions other points, which on the former occasion were probably included in the clause allowing him to carry out the details of the restoration of Catholicism in his own way. "He talks," says Hallam, who has investigated the history of this period more carefully than any other writer, "of a negotiation with the court of Rome to obtain the permission of having mass in the vulgar tongue, and communion in both kinds, as terms that would render his conversion agreeable to his subjects."<sup>26</sup> Before departing for Rome, James must have assured his father that his resolution was fixed, and that he would live and die a Jesuit. Charles, who had promised not to interfere with his vocation, gave him a large subsidy for the new novitiate at St. Andrea on the Quirinal, which Oliva was then erecting, in addition to the old building of St. Francis Borgia. He also desired that on this second journey his son should be accompanied by a Jesuit; for, as he was not a priest, he was unable to receive his father into the Church, or to administer the sacraments to him. With these

<sup>26</sup> Constitutional History, ii. 387.



instructions James left England. From that day he disappears from history ; and after his arrival in Rome, in November or December 1668, the name of De la Cloche, by which he was known in the novitiate, figures no more in the books of the society.

Towards the close of the year, a young gentleman, who passed for an Englishman, and travelled with a servant and a well-stored purse, took up his abode at a very humble inn at Naples. The host had a daughter, Teresa Corona, whose extraordinary beauty won the heart of the guest. After he had satisfied the ecclesiastical authorities that he was a Catholic, they were married, on the 19th of February 1669. It was not long before the attention of the neighbours was roused by their manner of life. Gold was observed to be suspiciously plentiful in the household of the poor innkeeper, and it began to be whispered that his English son-in-law was related to the king of Great Britain. Rumours came to the ear of the Spanish viceroy, who, in his solicitude for the honour of royalty, caused the stranger to be arrested. Letters were found in his possession bearing the title of Highness, together with many jewels and heaps of pistoles. He declared that he was Prince James Stuart, a son of the King of England, born in Jersey ; and he sent for the English consul in order to obtain his release. But he could neither speak English nor give any satisfactory evidence in support of his statement. The viceroy wrote to England to ascertain the truth of the story, and in the mean time treated his captive as a prisoner of state, and sent him to the fortress of Gaëta, whilst he shut up his wife in a convent. Nobody knew what to believe. "Which," writes the English agent, Kent, to Williamson, on the 30th of March, "whether will end in prince or cheat I shall endeavour to inform you hereafter." The bewildered governor allowed his prisoner fifty crowns a month for his maintenance, and permitted his wife's family to visit him. Early in June came the answer of King Charles to the viceroy, who thereupon proclaimed the mysterious personage an impostor, removed him from his honourable confinement at Gaëta to the dungeons for common malefactors at Naples, and condemned him to be whipped through the city. Teresa Corona was taken from her convent on the discovery of her husband's real character ; and the story, which was believed at the time, goes on to say that instead of being punished he was released at her intercession, and allowed to go to France, on a visit, as he affirmed, to his mother. Two months later he was again at Naples, asserting that his mother was dead. He called her the Lady Mary Stuart, of the house of the Barons of St. Mars, as it is in the contemporary English translation, or

of San Marzo, as it stands in the Italian copy of his will; and said that it was in consequence of her relationship with the royal family that the King was unwilling to acknowledge him. The will is dated 24 August 1669; and two days later the testator died, reiterating his statements in the same breath in which he recommended his soul to the mercy of God and the intercession of Our Lady, in terms of the deepest piety and resignation. He appointed his cousin, Lewis XIV., his executor; demanded of Charles, for his unborn child, either the principality of Wales or Monmouth, or a royal dukedom, with an income of a hundred thousand crowns, besides his mother's fortune, amounting to 16,000*l.* a-year; and left enormous legacies to his wife's relations and to the Church. "And this," says Kent, "is the end of that princely cheat, or whatever he was." The cautious agent did not venture to determine the adventurer's quality; and in the manuscript letter of news sent weekly to the English Government, called the *Gazzetta di Roma*, from which most of his information was derived, the Englishman is constantly called the English prince.

Yet none of these contemporaries knew that there was actually at that time a son of King Charles, born at Jersey of a lady of high rank, privately addressed as Highness, provided with money, and speaking French as his native tongue. Had they known it, and could they have discovered that the illegitimate prince was really called James Stuart; that though a novice, he was not ordained; and that all authentic traces of him were at an end from the moment of his arrival in Italy, at the very time when the English traveller put up at the inn of Corona,—if, in short, their knowledge had extended generally as far as ours, and had stopped where ours stops,—it is probable that they would not have hesitated to believe in the claims of the prisoner at Gaëta. The King's denial, and what followed, would not have shaken their conviction. Charles was always careful to conceal the existence of his son, and he was particularly tender of the mother's name. When informed that the young Jesuit who had refused his favour, and had gone forth to prepare the way for his father's conversion, was the husband of a publican's daughter at Naples, and had been thrown into prison after apprising the people of his rank and wealth, he would certainly not have responded to the appeal of the viceroy by a public acknowledgment. It was necessary, in order to shield the father, that the son should be proclaimed an impostor, and sentenced to condign punishment. But it was not necessary that he should be actually punished. Charles's interests were satisfied by his removal to the felons' prison, his sentence, and his immediate pardon. If the accusation had been true, the pardon could not have followed instantly on the dis-



covery ; the culprit, after leaving the scene of his disgrace, would not voluntarily have returned so soon ; and he would not have mingled with his dying prayers the solemn repetition of a lie, which could serve no further purpose but to bring down disappointment and notoriety on his widow. The claims which he prefers for his child, though inconsistent with his own disinterested conduct, might have proceeded from a natural anxiety to provide for his posterity.

This is the case for the prisoner. It falls to the ground in cross-examination. The tenor of the will itself is fatal to it. The real James Stuart, who was sure of being able to obtain every just demand, would not have compromised the reasonable prospects of his family by the falsehoods and the extravagance of this document. He had moreover in his possession papers which proved his claim, and would have delivered him from the rigours of the Spanish governor. There was no reason for his sudden appearance at Naples at the very moment when he was charged with a negotiation of the greatest moment to his father, his Church, and himself. Nor would he have called his mother by a name and title which are unquestionably fictitious. And yet in that imaginary name and title there may perhaps be found a key to the mystery of the birth of the young James Stuart. For though the Neapolitan adventurer was an impostor, he enjoyed good sources of information, and possessed, though imperfectly, the secrets of King Charles's son. He knew that he was born at Jersey, and that his birth had been recognised by his father ; and he had secured some of his papers and some of his property. All the wealth he showed at Naples did not come from that source ; for the young novice was not so rich, and the impostor must have robbed other people. But he had certainly either accompanied, as his servant, the man he represented, or stolen his letters. Whatever be the secret of this strange adventure, it is so certain that it was not the real James Stuart who died at Naples in August 1669, that it is worth while to institute a further inquiry as to the probable events of his subsequent career.<sup>27</sup>

He must have returned almost immediately to his father's court ; but here too he was compelled to lay aside the name which he had borne on his former journey. The same Henry de Rohan could not twice in two months seek an asylum in England without awakening the suspicions of that suspicious age. The name which he finally assumed is unknown, and we

<sup>27</sup> The papers from which this account is given are in the States-Paper Office, "Italian States," bundle 32 ; Letters of Kent, March 30, 1669, June 16, Aug. 31, and Sept. 7 ; News Letters, or Gazzette di Roma, of March 23, Ap. 6, Ap. 13, Ap. 20, June 11, Sep. 7. The Will is in the Domestic Papers, bundle for August 1669.

are unable with certainty to trace him farther. But it can hardly be doubted that among the French Jesuits of that period the eldest son of Charles II. may yet be identified. He was by speech and education a Frenchman, and it is likely that he again took a French name, and completed his novitiate in France or in Flanders. Had he quitted the order, he would have taken with him the grant of his pension, which lies at Rome. Had he returned to Rome, he would have resumed his former name. Had he remained in England, it is hard to believe that he could have escaped discovery at the time of the Popish Plot, or among the clergy who frequented the palace. He did not succeed in effecting the actual reconciliation of his father with the Church, for it is certain that that event did not occur before the eve of Charles's death. When Charles feared that his brother would expose himself to danger by bringing a priest, and when James declared he would do it at the risk of his life, they could only allude to the law which made it penal to receive a convert. The mere administration of the Sacrament to one already Catholic could get no one into trouble. Huddleston says that the King declared "that he was most heartily sorry for all the sins of his past life, and particularly for that he had deferred his reconciliation so long." This is implicitly confirmed by what he told Aprice, another priest, who wrote ten days later: "As Mr. Huddleston himself has told me, by a particular instance of God's grace, the King was as ready and apt in making his confession, and all other things, as if he had been brought up a Catholic all his lifetime."<sup>23</sup> If we had not these proofs that Charles had not been received into the Church before his last illness, still there could be no doubt upon the subject, as the application of James for leave to conceal his religion was rejected, and the publication would also in the case of the King have been the necessary condition of his admission into the Church.

James Stuart's ministrations to his father must therefore have been confined to the discussion of the Catholic doctrines. It is possible that a memorial of these discussions and exhortations may still be extant. Manuscript copies of the two papers on religion, in the handwriting of Charles, which were found in his cabinet and published by his brother, were sent to Rome by Father Giudici, the confessor of Mary Beatrice. These copies, attested by King James' own signature, are in French. That which was printed in England was a translation. It would have been useless to publish a French text in England, where an immediate and general effect was required. There could be no object in sending a copy of the translation to Rome, where the original could be understood and interpreted. The title of the

<sup>23</sup> Harris, *Life of Charles II.*, ii. 391.



copies in Rome proves that the publication had already taken place. If the originals were printed, it would have been enough to send a printed copy, which would have possessed greater authenticity than a manuscript translation. It is impossible to compare the French and the English versions without perceiving that the latter is a translation of the former,—inelegant, somewhat abridged, and not entirely faithful. The word *apogrifes*, which occurs in the French for *apocryphes*, shows that the papers were in the writing of a person who did not know theology. Father Giudici would not have allowed it to stand in the copy if it were not in the original manuscript of the King; but in the English edition the word was altogether omitted, probably because it would not be understood by Protestants in the sense in which the writer used it.

These papers, though in the handwriting of Charles II., were not composed by him. They are in the form of an argument, addressed by one person to another. For this he had no occasion, and he had no reason to write them in French. On the same ground, they cannot have been written by Bristol or Aubigny, to whom Burnet is inclined to attribute them. Bristol did not converse with the King in French. Aubigny, it is true, had spent most of his life in France, but he had not forgotten his native language. Little is known concerning him; but it is on record that his knowledge of English once saved his life. He was attacked at night by two English blood-hounds, who were kept in the garden of the Jacobins, and he pacified them by speaking to them in English.<sup>29</sup> Tallemant, who tells the tale, adds, that a thief who, being a Frenchman, had no means of making himself intelligible to the foreign dogs, was seized by them in getting over the wall, and soon despatched.

An ecclesiastic who conferred with Charles concerning his conversion after he had ascended the throne, and who knew French better than English, must have been the author of these compositions. This would bring the evidence to bear on the French priests about the Queen-mother or the Duke of York, such as Mansuète or La Colombière. But the tone of these writings is not that which would be adopted by a foreign priest addressing the King. They are written with confidence, frankness, and even familiarity, and they must have been written by one who, though he could not write in English, might consider himself an Englishman. England is more than once spoken of as "*nostre Angleterre*." There is reason, therefore, to suspect that we have in these letters a record of the religious earnestness and filial piety of the Stuart who preferred a cloister to the steps of his father's throne.

<sup>29</sup> *Historiettes de Tallemant des Reaux*, vii. 293.

Two years after the day when we lose sight of James Stuart, the question of the reconciliation of Charles II. with the Catholic Church had become a part of European politics, and an element in confederations and treaties. Lewis XIV. proposed that D'Estrées, then bishop of Laon, and afterwards cardinal, the most successful negotiator in his kingdom, should be employed to bring the matter before the Holy See. Charles received the proposal coldly. He told the French ambassador that he had already made choice of an English priest to treat with the Pope for his conversion, and that instructions were being prepared for him.<sup>30</sup> Arlington undertook to hasten his departure; but he was then at St. Omers, and the illness of Clement IX. made the King anxious to wait, as he did not wish, he said, to confide his secret to a dying man. It is most probable that the English priest at St. Omers, whom Charles had already arranged to send to Rome, was the same through whom he had previously opened the business. On his return from Rome at the end of the year 1668, Prince James Stuart found that the King had resolved to discuss his design with the ministers, and that the great interests involved, and the choice of the mode, and the time of declaring himself, would necessarily postpone the event. The negotiation with France for the dissolution of the Triple Alliance, on which it depended, required time, both on account of the secrecy which had to be preserved, and of the vast preparations which were made for the war, which was to be the signal for the change. James must have perceived that his time had not arrived, and he was doubtless anxious to finish his novitiate and to receive ordination. It is natural to conclude that he would retire to some house of the society where he could satisfy this desire, and still be at hand whenever his father's plans were ripe, and he should be summoned to be the instrument for their accomplishment. The college of St. Omers, or the neighbouring English novitiate at Watten, would be the fittest and likeliest place for him to inhabit.

We have no other probable record of his life. Once more, in the midst of the excitement of the Popish Plot, the mysterious figure of a foreign priest crosses the life of Charles. A gentleman told Welwood that he was employed to bring over privately a Romish priest, then beyond sea, by whose means the King had some secret matters to manage. The King and the priest were a considerable time together alone in the closet. At last the priest came out with all the marks of fright and astonishment in his face. Charles had been seized with a fit, and the priest would have called for help; but the King, who feared that their interview should become known, had strength and resolution to hold him

<sup>30</sup> Mignet, *Négociations relatives à la Succession d'Espagne*, iii. 232.



till he had recovered his speech.<sup>31</sup> Was this priest with whom Charles was in correspondence, whom he caused to be fetched secretly from foreign parts, and the discovery of whose presence he so passionately dreaded, his own son?

Among the letters of Oliva there is one that bears no date, addressed to a king who is not named, respecting a certain Jesuit, whose name is also concealed. This father, it appears, had received from the King an important office, which he used for the purpose of interfering in affairs of state, and had not only made enemies by his imprudence, but had injured the interests of the King, and had alienated, by the acrimony and disrespect of his language, persons who belonged to the royal party. He was accused of bearing himself more like a prince than a religious, and his superiors feared that when the King, who was the protector of the society, should be no more, they would incur great dangers through the animosity he had provoked. The general therefore asked leave to summon the father to Rome, promising that he should be treated with kindness. Of the seven kings then living in Europe, two, those of Sweden and Denmark, could not have been in friendly communication with the Jesuits, and neither of them in any way deserved to be called their protector. In France, in Spain, and in Portugal, it is difficult to understand what could be meant by the royal party, or by the fear of great calamities on the death of the King. Poland and England alone remain. Now there are in the collection other letters of Oliva to the King of Poland, and no secret is made about his name. The position of this father must have been quite peculiar. It is clear that he was not the King's confessor, and that he was not, like Father Petre, officially employed in political affairs; yet he had received from the King such a position that he could not be recalled like an ordinary Jesuit, and that the general was obliged to use elaborate precautions in order to obtain the King's consent, and to make the measure appear in his eyes as gentle as possible. This suggests a suspicion of some mystery. The General of the Jesuits writes to a sovereign whose name he does not venture to publish, for permission to summon to Rome a father of the society, who, though neither the confessor of the King, nor a member of the council, possesses considerable influence, and enjoys so much of the royal favour that, although his imprudence has injured the court, a pledge must be given in removing him that he will be treated well. If we imagine the Jesuit James Stuart established in England, exercising some influence over his father and the men of his confidence, and led astray, partly by zeal, partly by the presumption engendered by his royal descent, to commit some acts of imprudence, such as

<sup>31</sup> Welwood's *Memoirs*, p. 146.

those which were soon after so greatly exaggerated by popular rumour, and so cruelly punished by the popular fanaticism, it would exactly answer all the conditions of the case. These letters of Oliva were prepared for publication by himself. Every thing that is omitted is therefore designedly omitted, and the same caution which obliged him to conceal the name of the sovereign whom he addressed, would have prohibited any more distinct allusion by which the position of the offending Jesuit might be betrayed.

These grounds, however, are far from sufficient to justify us in believing that James Stuart, who began life with so much discretion and reserve, afterwards became an ambitious and intriguing politician, and put in jeopardy his father's crown and the fortunes of his order. That order occupied in Poland a position in which great influence at court was combined with great unpopularity with his party among the nobles. At the election of 1668, a cry was raised that the new king should be forbidden to have a Jesuit for his confessor; and, at the same time, the grand Hetman Sobieski was taking a Jesuit confessor with him to bless his arms in the Turkish war. To him, in the year 1673, Oliva sent his congratulations on his election. He tells him that the Jesuits whom he may place over his conscience or his chapel must be faithful to their rule, and abstain from politics; and in speaking of the new king's affection for the society he uses a word, *visceratamente*, that occurs in the same connexion in the letter which is not directed. It may therefore refer to a father to whom Sobieski had committed some important functions in his court, and the name of the patron may be omitted lest the name of the offender should be surmised. Long after the probable date of this letter John sent a bitter complaint to Oliva of the faults of the brethren in Poland. "I feel bound," he said, "both by interest and affection, to advise you to seek a remedy for the growing evils, and to remove from the Jesuits in Poland the too visible contagion of ambition and cupidity."<sup>32</sup> Between his predecessor and Oliva there had also been a friendly correspondence. Michael Korybuth was afflicted with a fabulous voracity. The stories told of the classical gluttons of antiquity are eclipsed by his horrible achievements. Once, it is related, the burghers of Dantzic presented him with a thousand China apples, and before night he had devoured them all. Oliva, like a prudent general, attacked this monarch at his weak point. A quantity of the finest chocolate has been sent to him from Mexico, and he straightway despatches one of his fathers to lay it at the feet of the King of Poland,—“impelled,” he says, “by a reverent

<sup>32</sup> Salvandy, *Histoire de Jean Sobieski*, ii. 97.



solicitude to minister as well as I can to the weakness of your stomach, which has already been fortified by drugs of this kind." On the whole, then, it is most probable that James Stuart is not the subject of the general's letter to the nameless correspondent; and comparing his letters written to the two kings, it is more likely to have been sent to John Sobieski than to his respected but inglorious predecessor.

The manuscripts I have quoted, most of which I owe to the industry and kindness of Father Boero, librarian of the Gesù,<sup>33</sup> by whose care they have been brought to light and transcribed, reveal the influence actually exerted by religious sentiment in those transactions between Charles and Lewis XIV., which, as the occasion of the Popish Plot, and the commencement of that policy which terminated in the Revolution of 1688, occupy so important a place in our history. The intention of declaring himself a Catholic manifested by the King in the early part of his reign, and checked by the attitude of Parliament, was revived, as we have seen, in the summer of 1668. In the month of April Charles first expressed to the ambassador of Lewis the wish to form an alliance with his master.<sup>34</sup> As he had lately joined a league of Protestant powers, whose pur-

<sup>33</sup> I subjoin a list of the documents for which I am indebted to Father Boero. They are manifestly too long to be published *in extenso* in a Review.

1. Lettre de la Reine Mère (Henrietta) au Card. Orsini. De Londres, 30 oct. 1662.

2. Lettre de la Reine Catherine au même. De Londres, oct. 25, 1662.

3. Voto in favore della promozione al Cardinalato del Signor d' Aubigny.

4. Favori e benefizi fatti ai cattolici d' Inghilterra dal Re presente (in sixteen articles).

5. Bellings to Father Thos. Courtenay, Oct. 22, 1662.

6. Lettera dal Card. Orsini al Card. Sforza Pallavicino. 24 gennaio 1663.

7. Oblatio ex parte Caroli II. Magnæ Britanniae Regis pro optatissima trium suorum regnorum Angliæ, Scotiæ et Hiberniæ cum Sede Apostolica Romana reunione.

8. Certificate of Charles II. in favour of Sieur James Stuart, his natural son.

9. Another Certificate of the King to the same.

10. Certificate of Christine Queen of Sweden concerning the same, on his conversion at Hamburg.

11. Letter of Charles II. to the General of the Jesuits, Oliva, at Rome. Whitehall, Aug. 3, 1668.

12. Letter of Charles II. to his son James Stuart at Rome. Whitehall, Aug. 4, 1668.

13. Letter of Charles II. to Oliva, General of the Jesuits, at Rome. Whitehall, Aug. 29, 1668.

14. Letter of the same to the same. Without date.

15. Reply of Oliva to the King's three letters. Livorno, Oct. 14, 1668.

16. Certificate of Charles that he will pay the expenses of his son's voyage. Nov. 18, 1668.

17. Letter of Charles to Oliva. Whitehall, 18 Nov. 1668.

18 and 19. Two Memoirs written by Charles II. on the Catholic religion.

<sup>34</sup> See the Despatches of the French Ambassadors Colbert and Ruigny, in Mignet, iii. 10 sq., and iv. 42 sq.

pose it was to arrest the ambition of that monarch, he desired that the understanding between them might be private. He said that he wished to treat as between gentlemen, and that he preferred the word of Lewis to all the parchments in the world. At first Lewis received these advances with reserve, and Charles and his brother were unwilling to trust to the ambassador the secret object of their overtures. But early in 1669 Lord Arundel was sent to Paris, accompanied by Sir Richard Bellings,<sup>35</sup> who was instructed to draw up the articles of the treaty by which England was to join France against the Dutch; while Lewis undertook to support Charles with money, that he might be able to declare himself a Catholic without having a parliament to fear. Of the two leading ministers of the Cabal, the Catholic Arlington was friendly to the Dutch alliance, whilst Buckingham, a Protestant, was a partisan of France. Though the latter encouraged the notion of a French alliance, he knew nothing of his master's design relative to the Catholic religion. It was confided to Arlington, and at length overcame his political scruples; but he was never reconciled to the war with Holland, and he endeavoured to postpone hostilities until the change of religion had been declared. The French envoy suspected that he wished to delude Lewis into supplying the means by which the King's conversion could be published without danger, and when that was done, to avoid quarrelling with the Dutch. The confidential envoys of Charles at Paris evidently entertained the same idea,<sup>36</sup> and the scheme was near succeeding.

Charles opened his mind to the French ambassador, the brother of the great Colbert, on the 12th of November 1669. It was, he said, the most important secret of his life, and he would probably be considered mad, and all those with him who were undertaking to restore Catholicism in England. Nevertheless he hoped, with the help of Lewis, to succeed in that great work. The sects hated the Established Church more than the Catholic religion, and would make no resistance if they obtained the freedom they desired. The great fortresses were in the hands of trusty men, and the Irish army might be relied upon; for Lord Orrery, who was at heart a Catholic, would take the lead if Ormond should refuse. On this point Charles was mistaken; for Orrery was sent for, and had an interview with the King, in which he was informed of the design, and refused to take part

<sup>35</sup> Clarke, i. 442.

<sup>36</sup> "Il m'a paru que l'affaire de religion étant ce qui tient le premier lieu dans l'esprit de M. le Comte d'Arondel, il n'y a que le retardement de la déclaration qui le touche; et comme il croit que la guerre contre les Hollandais produiroit cet effet-là, c'est la seule raison pour laquelle il s'y oppose." Turenne to Ruigny: *Mémoires de Turenne*, i. 669.



in it.<sup>37</sup> "He ended by saying that he was urged by his conscience, and by the confusion he saw increasing daily in his kingdom, to the diminution of his authority, to declare himself a Catholic; and that, besides the spiritual advantage he would derive from it, he considered also that it was the only way of restoring the monarchy." Lewis applauded the intention, but advised that it should be postponed until after the war; for he feared that he might be deprived of the assistance of England by the internal dissensions which that measure would be sure to provoke. These two influences contended for a while in the mind of Charles, but he had not strength of purpose to resist the pressure that came from France. Arlington said of him, that he saw at once what was to be done in every affair that was submitted to him, and supported his opinion with good reasons, but that he did not take the trouble to go into the objections that were made, and, if he was spoken to again, often allowed himself to be carried away by the opinions of others.<sup>38</sup> This description was now verified. Charles shrank from the incongruity of the life he was then leading with a conversion which would be an arduous political undertaking. "The danger," says Colbert, "greatly alarms all who are in the secret, yet it has no effect on the mind of the king. But his mode of life—*un peu de libertinage, si j'ose parler ainsi*—makes him put it off as long he can." The famous journey of Henrietta, Duchess of Orleans, to Dover, in May 1670, settled the question in favour of France. The treaty which was then signed by the four Catholic counsellors of Charles was first published from the English copy by Lingard. Mignet gives it from the French archives, and the texts do not entirely correspond.

Henrietta was in the secret of the whole scheme from the beginning, and we learn through her that Charles was at that time in direct communication with the Holy See. There was a French prelate whom she patronised, Daniel de Cosnac, Bishop of Valence and afterwards Archbishop of Aix, a clever, witty, and extravagant man, highly ambitious of a cardinal's hat. A year before the treaty was signed, she wrote to him that, among a variety of affairs which were being treated between France and England, this country would soon have one with Rome of such consequence, and on account of which the Pope would be so happy to oblige the King her brother, that she was persuaded he would refuse him nothing. She had already taken her measures with him to make him ask for a cardinal's hat, without saying for whom; Charles had promised, and it was to be for Cosnac.<sup>39</sup> After her return from Dover, but a few days before

<sup>37</sup> Morrice, *Life of Orrery*, p. 86.

<sup>38</sup> *Mémoires de Gourville*, p. 566, ed. Michaud.

<sup>39</sup> *Mémoires de Cosnac*, i. 383.

that tragic death-scene which Bossuet has made memorable by the most striking of his orations, she informed the Bishop that she had succeeded in her mission, and that her brother had given her his word once more. Cosnac was not satisfied with these assurances. The influence of a Protestant king appeared to him a poor security for his elevation. But the Duchess told him that she not only had her brother's promise, but that the Pope had already granted his request, and she informed him, he says, of all that had passed between Pope Clement IX. and the kings of France and England.<sup>40</sup> This statement is not, however, supported by any of her letters that have been preserved; and we must bear in mind the judgment of his biographer, the Abbé de Choisy, on the character of Cosnac: "He is a man of surprising vivacity, and of such eloquence that it is impossible to doubt his words, although their number is so great that they cannot all be true." The agent on this occasion appears to have been the Lady Diana Digby, daughter of the Earl of Bristol, who had been so eager, six years before, to bring home to Clarendon a charge of corresponding with the Pope and Cardinals. In June 1669, she arrived at Rome, in the coach of Cardinal Rospigliosi, the Pope's nephew, and lived for a time in one of his palaces so privately that her own cousin, James Russell, was not allowed to see her. But she was in correspondence with the English priests, and it was believed in Rome that the nomination of Archbishop Plunket to the see of Armagh, which was much opposed by Spain, had been obtained by her influence.<sup>41</sup>

Before any thing could be done, the design was again betrayed, and once more, and for the last time, Parliament intervened. It was generally believed that the object of the war against Holland was the establishment of the Catholic faith. It is said that Arlington divulged the secret, partly in order to ruin Clifford, and partly to dissolve the French alliance. Even Protestant statesmen, talking in private with the King, spoke of it as a thing about which there was neither doubt nor concealment. Temple, before returning to the Hague in 1674, had an interview with Charles. He went, as he expresses it, to the bottom of the matter, showing how difficult, if not impossible, it was to set up here the same religion and government that was in France, and assuring him that even those who were indifferent to religion would not consent to have it changed by force

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. ii. 81. "Retardabant eum voluptates blandissimæ dominæ, et quædam iners et pene somnuculosa natura, quam tamen plura animi ingenii-que bona comitabantur. Huic quidem stimulos admovisse suspicor Clementem per occultos homines." Fabroni, *Vitæ Itætorum*, ii. 107.

<sup>41</sup> State-Paper Office, "Italian States," Letters of Kent, June 29, July 6, Aug. 10, 1669.



of an army.<sup>42</sup> Charles relinquished his design, and recalled the warning which his father on the scaffold had intended to impress on his son, as well as on Juxon, by the famous word "Remember,"—that if ever he came to the crown, he should so govern his subjects as not to force them to extremities. He declared that he was too old to go abroad again, and that he left that to his brother, if he had a mind to try it. For the ten remaining years of that reign, James took the lead in all the schemes for the restoration of the Church. It was of him that Coleman wrote in his fatal letter to La Chaise: "If he could gain any considerable new addition of power, all would come over to him as the only centre of our government, and nobody could contend with him farther. Then would Catholicks be at ease, and His Most Christian Majesty's interest secured with us in England, beyond all apprehensions whatsoever." But the most Christian king, as he had prevented the declaration of religion before the Dutch war, endeavoured afterwards to have the design abandoned. He found that the English Parliament was not averse to the French alliance, provided it was not used for the promotion of Popery and arbitrary power in England; and Lewis was quite willing that religion should be sacrificed in order to save his popularity with the English Protestants. Finding that the supposed connection of the King's conversion with the French alliance had brought suspicion on his ambassador, he replaced him by Ruvigny, who was a Calvinist. The new laws which were made against the Catholics, for the purpose of diverting suspicion, received his approbation; and he acted upon the hint given him by Bristol, that the House of Commons would be favourable to the French alliance if the belief in the existence of the secret treaty for the restoration of Catholicism could be removed. That unhappy scheme defiled all that it touched, and neither those who shared in it nor those who condemned it came out of the transaction with honour.

If in the seventeenth century, which achieved so much for civil liberty, freedom of conscience was not established in England, the fault lay with the oppressed communities as much as with the crown or the dominant church. The Catholics and the Protestant sects were alike intolerant. The latter deserved what they received, and justified by their theories and their acts the penal laws by which they suffered. They were ready to do to others what was done to them. No religious party in the country admitted the right of minorities to the protection of the law. Religious liberty grew up in England as the fruit of civil liberty, of which it is a part, and in conjunction with which it has yet much way to make. But if the Protestants were not

<sup>42</sup> Courtenay, *Memoirs of Sir W. Temple*, i. 425.

sincere in arguing for toleration, the Catholics were not honest in the means by which they endeavoured to obtain it. They sought as a concession that which was a right ; they wished for privilege instead of liberty ; and they defended an exception and not a principle. The Catholics of that age had degenerated from the old medieval spirit, which stood by the right and respected the law, but did not stoop to power. In the great constitutional struggle they disregarded the impending absolutism and the outraged laws, and gave to the royal cause, when it was most in fault, a support which, by prolonging the contest, drove the parliamentary opposition into lawless extremes, and postponed for half a century the establishment of freedom. After the Restoration, they again trusted their interests to the favour of the court, and were willing to purchase advantages for their religion by political guilt, and to gain private ends at the price of a common servitude. That criminal and short-sighted policy brought quick retribution upon them, and explains how the party which saved the constitution in 1688 imposed disabilities on those who, by similar inconsistency, had been the declared adversaries of that freedom which their Church had helped to institute.

J. D. A.

---



THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE.<sup>1</sup>

IN tracing the relations between causes and effects, we cannot fail to be struck with the fact that the very recent formation of a *science* of language—by which is meant, not the learning this or that language, but the reasoning upon language as a universality—has arisen with the almost equally recent increase in the facilities of reaching with speed, safety, and with no serious amount of personal sacrifice, even the more remote regions of the earth. That, in its turn, has given rise to the discovery and removal of many monuments containing inscribed records of the more ancient dialects of the human race. The general facts, that languages were very numerous, very different from each other, and capable of being classed in families according to certain affinities; that some had a literature, some not; that some were no longer spoken, others fast becoming extinct,—these and other obvious accidents had long been known to scholars. But the question, *What is language?* was found to open a far wider and grander prospect for the contemplative mind. This, though not exactly new as a subject of speculation, is still new as a systematic science. Comparative philology introduced it; and in this country it has been fostered and promoted by many intelligent writers on the English language, and the forms and phases it has undergone. To the Germans, however, we owe the creation of the science as such, and not least to the distinguished philologist who has in a manner become naturalised in the University of Oxford, and the title of whose important work on language is prefixed to the present article.

By the science of language, then, is comprehended both the collection of facts about words and their inflexions, and also the investigation of the metaphysical principles on which the laws of human speech appear to depend.

It is probable that primitive man, in his earliest efforts to communicate his wants or his wishes to his neighbour, made use of three principal means—signs or gestures, rude representations of the objects he intended to express, and the articulation of various sounds. All these are perhaps equally natural; certain it is, they have been employed for the above purposes in every age. By signs a good part of the conversation that takes place between civilised man and savage tribes is still necessarily conducted, whenever chance or philanthropy brings them into con-

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on the Science of Language. By Max Müller, M.A., Fellow of All Souls, Oxford. London, 1862.

An Essay on the Origin of Language. By Frederick W. Farrar, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: John Murray, 1860.

tact. As a literary example, we might instance Cassandra in the *Agamemnon*<sup>2</sup> of Æschylus. She, a Trojan captive, and speaking a foreign tongue, is instructed to signify her intentions "by her barbaric hand." The art of representing letters by the fingers, and so conversing with dumb people by the hand, is a proof at once of the possibility and of the value of this means of communication as a substitute for speech.

All written alphabets fall under the second head—that of expressing by marks to the eye, and not by sounds to the ear, what we wish to convey to the mind. Of this pictorial or representative language it is hardly necessary to say that we have the most ancient existing specimens in Egyptian hieroglyphics. This is simply a series of pictures<sup>3</sup> or symbols; and of a similar class are the devices on the ancient ruined temples discovered in Central America. The Hebrew alphabet has been plausibly traced to certain shapes or postures of men or animals; and though we do not know the origin or meaning of the very various forms of letters in the existing languages of the world, it is reasonable to infer that they had their origin generally in shapes or outlines expressive of objects.

Quite independent of either of these two modes of conveying ideas is the faculty of speaking. Language is, philosophically considered, wholly detached from any external signs, and is capable of the highest cultivation and development without the art of writing it. We are too apt to associate books and literature with talking and conversing; and the more so because, in modern times, letter-writing has become almost another form of conversing. Our notions of learning a language suggest at once the aid of dictionaries and grammars. But the case was not so in the ancient world, nor has it ever been so among the ruder tribes of mankind. The Anglo-Saxons spoke of the Roman occupants of Britain as "the Book-Latins,"<sup>4</sup> their literature being taken as their distinguishing characteristic. Were any proof of the fact wanted, we might cite the Homeric poems, which, in all probability, were not written at all till some four centuries later than Homer; and Homer himself, it is well known, not only does not allude to writing, as such, but intimates the use of symbols or hieroglyphics.<sup>5</sup> Hieroglyphics, in their earliest use, must have been sculptured or written only, and not pronounced. Articulate sounds alone constitute language proper. And it is on this alone that we propose at present to offer some remarks.

<sup>2</sup> v. 1027.

<sup>3</sup> Tacitus, Ann. xi. 14. "*Primi per figuras animalium Ægyptii sensus mentis effingebant: ea antiquissima monumenta memoriæ humanæ impressa saxis cernuntur.*"

<sup>4</sup> *Bóc-leden*, in the beginning of the Saxon Chronicle.

<sup>5</sup> Il. vi. 168.



It is a common observation that man is distinguished from animals not only by his reason, but by his faculty of language. The two things, indeed, are virtually inseparable, because language is the result, as it is the vehicle, of rational thought; the one is the correlative of the other, and the two must coexist. But, anatomically speaking, it is not certain that man has *organs* of voice very different from, or very much more flexible than, animals have, since even a parrot can articulate nearly as well as man. Nor, again, is it safe to conclude that animals have no reason. This is not more true than that man has no instinct. A new-born child would take the breast by pure instinct, as a bird builds its nest or selects food for its young; but many animals show certain feeble powers of memory, design, combination, and forethought, which are results of an inferior kind of reason. Strictly speaking, therefore, man differs from animals, in these two respects, only in degree and not in kind.

Of the origin of human language Holy Writ says nothing. We find, however, that Adam could converse and give names to external objects: "And Adam called all the beasts by their names, and all the fowls of the air, and all the cattle of the field."<sup>6</sup> Man is a talking animal, and therefore he must have a language to exercise that faculty upon; he must talk, just as he must eat, if left to his own natural impulse. It seems to follow that he has the inherent capability of developing language. Nevertheless, as an infant does not talk at first, but by a gradual and rather slow process, and even then by imitation rather than by intuition,<sup>7</sup> so language must have had a beginning and a growth. It is not unlikely that it also had a maturity and a decline; but of that we say nothing now.

Recent researches have established many wonderful facts connected with the history of human language, by the aid of the science of comparative philology; but we still know nothing certain of its origin, any more than, apart from the account given us in Scripture, we could speculate on the mode or process by which man was first placed on the earth. One of our great difficulties undoubtedly consists in this, that, whereas linguists can easily class together large numbers of dialects, ancient and modern, and pronounce them to have had a common descent, by observing their common laws of inflexion or common word-roots, there are other families of language which at present appear to have no certain or definite connection with each other. This is a difficulty, but it is not an insuperable one; and it is satisfactory to think that as all scientific research seems now tending to confirm

<sup>6</sup> Genesis ii. 20.

<sup>7</sup> It would without doubt be a profoundly interesting experiment to study the vocal sounds of a child of twelve or fifteen years who had never heard man's voice. But such a chance can hardly occur.

the revealed fact of the descent of the human race from a common pair,<sup>8</sup> so the conclusions of the best linguists may ultimately succeed in establishing a common source and centre of primeval language.

Another difficulty remains, if indeed it be a difficulty; we seem forced to claim for the scientific phenomena now discovered in human language a greater amount of time than hitherto has been reckoned, on what may eventually prove to be a misconceived system of the chronology of the human race. More time for the existence of man on earth appears as necessary for explaining the connection between extinct and existing dialects, as a vastly extended period is absolutely required for linking together the fossil forms revealed by geology and the existing organic forms. As in the latter case science places us in this inevitable dilemma, "either there were many successive extinctions and re-creations of all living things, or the types and forms have gradually changed by an immensity of time having lapsed;" so in the case of language, philologists are (at present at least) led to conclude, "either languages had not a common origin, or a much longer time must be assumed for their development from one source than has hitherto been conceded."

The argument may be very briefly stated thus: If it can be proved that languages of a very high organisation, and perfectly distinct, existed some two thousand years before the Christian era, can we limit their separation into families, and their independent development, according to all the known analogies of dialectic changes, to the very short period which remains according to the commonly received chronology?

Exactly a similar argument meets us, and requires a similar answer, to account for the physical differences which are so obstinately permanent in the different races of man. We know historically the antiquity of these differences, and that they were generally the same nearly four thousand years ago as now exist. We require a very long period to account for climatic and other influences making such changes, or we call in the aid of an unrecorded miracle, or we must join the ranks of those who advocate the descent of mankind from distinct pairs. And surely the first of these solutions, as it is by far the most satisfactory in a scientific point of view, so is by far the most reasonable.

That all primitive languages consisted of roots, or monosyllabic sounds, may now be regarded as an ascertained fact. Indeed, we have a living witness of it in the Chinese, in which, as one of the greatest of modern linguists<sup>9</sup> assures us, "every word

<sup>8</sup> We need hardly remark that the Scriptural account had been eagerly impugned by rationalists, and more soberly questioned by scientific writers.

<sup>9</sup> Müller, p. 274.



is a root, and every root is a word. It is, in fact, the most primitive stage in which we can imagine human language to have existed." And whereas former speculators had reduced the number of these primitive roots to only about a dozen (thus putting man's power of articulation on a level with that of beasts only), more scientific reasoners consider that they were at first almost infinite, and gradually reduced to a convenient number by a process of natural elimination.<sup>10</sup>

The theories to account for the origin of language have been principally the following :

1. That it was innate in man ; that is, that man spoke and conversed perfectly when the first pair were created.

2. That it was communicated to our first parents directly from God.

3. That it originated from an endeavour to imitate natural sounds or noises, as those of lions, birds, thunder, the rushing of water, falling bodies, &c.; examples of which kind of words in our own language are, *crash, clang, rattle, rush, thump, bang, ring, &c.*

4. That monosyllabic sounds were *invented* to express objects, such as the primary wants of nature rendered most necessary and most familiar, *e.g.* drink, food, fire, house, &c.; and that these were augmented as civilisation advanced, and the number of objects consequently increased, and required distinct names.

5. That language was in a manner *extorted* from man, *i.e.* involuntarily elicited, in the way of interjections and exclamations, by the emotions of surprise, fear, pain, want; and that the consciousness of the faculty being thus attained, its exercise then became a mere matter of convenience.

To these one might add a sixth theory, but that its unsoundness is self-evident. It has been thought, that language may have resulted from a common compact, or agreement as to what things should be called by what names; but it is evident that such a proceeding presupposes some kind of language.

Of the first of these theories, since it is a mere *petitio principii*, nothing need here be said. Of the second, viz. that language under one form was communicated to man from God, able, pious, and eminent defenders have been found. These theorists would derive all other primitive languages from the confusion of tongues at Babel; and they think the discovery of the primeval tongue to be still possible. This, however, is not only a pure assumption, but it is completely opposed to all the scientific facts revealed by comparative philology. It is a theory which ends all inquiry at once, and saves all further thought

<sup>10</sup> Müller, p. 388.

about it. But it has been truly said, "Theologians, who claim for language a divine origin, drift into the most dangerous anthropomorphism, when they enter into any details as to the manner in which they suppose the Deity to have compiled a dictionary and grammar in order to teach them to the first man, as a schoolmaster teaches the deaf and dumb; and they do not see that, even if all their premisses were granted, they would have explained no more than how the first man might have learnt a language, if there was a language ready made for him. How that language was made, would remain as great a mystery as ever."<sup>11</sup>

To the third and fifth theories it is enough to reply, that though every language contains *some* words expressive of natural sounds, or exclamations, such words form an infinitesimal part of entire vocabularies, and never could have given rise to that which is the basis of all language—the enunciation of general and abstract ideas. The fourth theory is untenable on the same grounds; for it has been found, by the analysis of word-roots, that so far from general ideas having been named from external objects, the exact converse is the case; *e. g.* fire, cold, house, dress, and so on, in all languages imply a previous conception of the abstract notions of heat, shelter, cover, and their contraries.

We must, then, have recourse to a seventh theory. All languages sprang from monosyllabic, uninflected *roots*; and those roots were not *invented*, but *produced* by a linguistic faculty or principle in human nature, intuitively and by an absolute necessity, and without man himself having any arbitrary control over it whatever. "Roots," says the same authority,<sup>12</sup> "are *phonetic types*, produced by a power inherent in human nature." And he adds, "The faculty peculiar to man in his primitive state, by which every impression from without received its vocal expression from within, must be accepted as an ultimate fact. These roots are the original property of primeval language, and have never been added to since."<sup>13</sup>

Man, we may say, could not help talking, because he talked by instinct. He talks *a language* when it has been formed for him; but he talks *something which becomes a language* when left to himself. Conceive the following case, which is scarcely beyond the bounds of actual possibility. Three, or even two, adult individuals, who have been reared by dumb nurses from their earliest infancy, and have never heard the sound of any human voice, are suddenly brought together on an uninhabited island, and continue to live together for years. Would they remain mute, or utter mere animal sounds; or would they de-

<sup>11</sup> Müller, p. 347.<sup>12</sup> Müller, p. 387.<sup>13</sup> Müller, p. 27.



velop some form of speech? We cannot doubt that they would do the latter; and if this be conceded, we may be said to have realised the right, the only philosophical view of the origin of language. It appears further, that they would *generalise, before they would particularise*. This may seem a paradox,—certainly it appears hard to comprehend; but we must accept it as the present result at least of the profoundest researches into the science of language. “The fact that every word is originally a predicate,—that names, though signs of individual conceptions, are all without exception derived from general ideas,—is one of the most important discoveries in the science of language.”<sup>14</sup>

If we look a little deeper into this question, we shall see that this is, in fact, a logical conclusion, apart from the investigation of the meanings of word-roots. If language is the expression of *reason*, it will necessarily deal at once with the abstract; if of mere brute sensation, it will not get beyond the expression of bodily feelings,—a sort of language which all brutes possess, and apparently in a degree sufficient for themselves. It follows, that the theories of the origin of language enumerated above (3, 4, 5,) are all founded on inadequate, and indeed degrading, conceptions of man’s primeval condition and mental powers.

The language of animals differs from the language of man in this very essential particular, viz. that the sounds uttered by them admit of no increase, no change, no development, and so exhibit none of the phenomena of language. The dog’s *bow-wow* of to-day is the same *bow-wow* that Aristophanes<sup>15</sup> expressed in words four centuries before the Christian era. On the contrary, the extraordinary and unbounded flexibility of human language is its most striking characteristic. Take a Greek, or a French, or an English dictionary, and try to form some notion of the number of words each contains. To that number add German, Welsh, Hebrew, Sanscrit, and a hundred others, and we can hardly realise the conception of the changes which human language admits of. How rapid, too, in some cases, those changes have been. English readers generally have almost to construe Chaucer, though only five centuries have elapsed since he wrote; and the Romans in Cicero’s time could hardly have understood the Latinity on the tombs of the Scipios, less than two hundred years old, or the yet ruder Latin even of still existing inscriptions.<sup>16</sup> Deviations, additions, simplifications in spelling and pronouncing may proceed with almost any degree of rapidity or to any extent; yet *new* languages are not thereby created, properly speaking, any more than varieties

<sup>14</sup> Müller, p. 386.

<sup>15</sup> Vesp. 902.

<sup>16</sup> See examples in Donaldson’s Varronianus, p. 229, &c.

produced by art in plants or animals are *new* races. French and Italian and Spanish are only changed forms of Latin, with admixtures from other dialects; in the same way as English and German are modified from the old Gothic, or at least from some kindred dialect. *Families* of language still remain quite as distinct as they were when the first dawn of history appears. Herein, as already stated, is a difficulty which has yet to be satisfactorily solved.

Lucretius, a profound thinker, and perhaps as good a philosopher as any one could be who occasionally reasoned from false or insufficient data, has some admirable remarks on the origin of human language. His reasoning is briefly this: "Language was, as it were, extorted by the same kind of necessity which induces infants to make gestures to signify their wants. To suppose that any one person gave and communicated names to things is folly; for what *he* could do, others could equally do for themselves. The very ideas of common utility, and the faculty of knowing what others wished, imply some sort of language. No authority either would compel men who were dumb to listen to a series of sounds they could not comprehend. Rather, we need not feel surprised if the same principle which induced cattle, who have no language, to express varied emotions by varied sounds, likewise taught man, who had the faculty of speech (*cui vox et lingua vigeret*), to name things by different words, according to his different perceptions of them."<sup>17</sup>

He then gives the following ingenious illustrations: "A hound, when excited to wrath, expresses his threats in a very different tone from the ordinary hunting-bark. Different again are the sounds we hear when a bitch plays with her puppies, when she welcomes her master, when she is left alone in a house, when she is in fear of the lash. The whinnying of a mare at breeding time is very different from the snorting of a charger who hears the sound of arms. Birds utter different notes when seeking their prey and when fighting; rooks and ravens alter their notes even with changes of weather." And he concludes thus:

"Ergo si varii sensus animalia cogunt,  
Muta tamen cum sint, varias emittere voces,  
Quanto mortales magis æquum est tum potuisse  
Dissimiles alia atque alia res voce notare."<sup>18</sup>

This is all very well put, and it is faulty or deficient only in this, that the poet takes into account man's linguistic faculty alone, without considering his reasoning powers, which must have expression through speech. He regards man only in his

<sup>17</sup> Lucretius. lib. v. 1028-1090.

<sup>18</sup> Lucretius, lib. v. 1087.



animal capacity, and not as a moral, responsible, rational being. But of the natural and inevitable development of talking by talking organs he seems to have formed a just conception.

Assuming, as we must now do, and as there appear to be the best and soundest reasons for doing, that the first stage of organised language was the use of roots expressive of general ideas, we may next remark, that language, in its ulterior and highly developed forms, and as we now know it both in ancient and in modern dialects, appears to have passed through five principal stages or progressive steps, which are these :

1. The use of simple roots.
2. The use of compound or reduplicated roots.
3. Inflected roots.
4. Mutilation or cutting down of too highly inflected, and therefore cumbrous, forms.
5. Reconstruction, or the creation of new on the ruins of old forms.

If this statement can be proved true, it follows that language has had its several periods of rise, consummate elaboration, and decline. This perhaps is only a general truth; yet some facts fall in with it which are very curious.

One is this—that in the almost countless and often widely differing dialects of African and American races, as well as in those of the native Australians and New Zealanders, of which some scanty knowledge has been attained by traders and missionaries, vestiges are invariably to be found of much more highly inflected archetypal languages, out of which, after the decay of the originals, these comparatively debased languages have passed. Thus, even in the dialects of the Hottentots and Bushmen of South Africa, who are about the lowest tribes of men on earth, and whose language may be supposed to be equally debased,—indeed, it has been called a mere jargon, and its chief characteristic is a certain clucking of the tongue,—even here we find evident marks of systematic inflexion in genders, numbers, and verbs. Dr. Burchell, the learned and distinguished explorer of South Africa, who spent many years in travelling among these wild tribes, has given us important glossaries of Hottentot words, and also specimens of other different dialects more allied to the Kaffirs.<sup>19</sup> The numerals, up to twenty, of the Kora Hottentots have none of them the slightest resemblance to Indo-Germanic roots, except *dési* (pronounced *daysy*) for ten, the resemblance of which to *decem* is probably accidental. *One* and *two* are *kuii* (*quee*) and *kam*; *eleven* and *twelve* are *kwika* and *kamkwa*; *guna* is *three*, and *gunakwa* is

<sup>19</sup> Travels in the Interior of South Africa, by W. J. Burchell, Esq. 2 vols. 4to, 1824. See vol. ii. pp. 251 and 583.

*thirteen*; *five* is *kuru*. But in the Sichuana, another Hottentot dialect, *peeri* is *two*, and *charnu* is *five*. Yet numerals, it is well known, are commonly among the most primitive forms in every language, and are least liable to dialectic changes. In the Kora tongue *moon* is *kaam*, and *new moon* is *kam kaam*, or *moon-moon*; thus affording an example of the law of reduplicated roots.

The only word we recognise in either dialect is *ma*, 'mother,' in the Sichuana. This, however, is easily explained. The first efforts of a child to articulate consist of *labials*. Hence *abba*, *pa*, *papa*, *ma*, *mamma*, *baby*, are strictly natural sounds; and so *ta*, *ba*, mixed dentals and labials, are common infantine expressions. There was a word *tata*, father;<sup>20</sup> and infants say "tattar" for 'good-by.' The same, indeed, is said of the Malayan tongues. All appear to indulge in long compounds, made up of agglutinated word-roots, so that a single word often expresses a sentence. The same holds true with the most ancient form of Greek with which we are acquainted—the language of Homer. Undoubtedly, as we read it, the words have been extensively modernised by long successive ages and repeated recensions. Yet the language is there, only somewhat disguised by a later orthography. No one supposes that Homer, nearly a thousand years before Christ, *invented* any single form of the language. It was there before him, and he used it. But Greek, as Greek, probably existed as a distinct language a thousand years before his time. Now the Homeric language, in some respects, is more highly inflected than the later Attic of Plato and Demosthenes. Yet far more richly inflected, and far more perfect as a language, appears to be that ancient Indian tongue with which both Greek and Latin are most intimately allied, the Sanscrit.<sup>21</sup> It seems, therefore, impossible to regard Sanscrit as a less ancient language than Hebrew; and yet it is totally and entirely distinct. "It is impossible," says Professor Müller,<sup>22</sup> "to imagine an Aryan" (*i. e.* Indo-Germanic) "language derived from a Semitic" (or Hebrew stock), "or a Semitic from an Aryan language. The grammatical framework is totally distinct in these two families of speech." Yet both (he adds) "presuppose a finished system of grammar previous to the first divergence of their dialects."<sup>23</sup>

It is evident that the tendency to inflect may proceed so far

<sup>20</sup> Martial, i. 100. *Täte* still means 'father' in Friesland (Müller, p. 50).

<sup>21</sup> Prof. Müller asserts (*Lectures*, p. 201) that Sanscrit was spoken in India "at least some centuries before the time of Solomon." He shows that many of the words used in the account of building Solomon's Temple, expressing materials used in the fabric, are not Hebrew, but genuine Sanscrit or Indian words.

<sup>22</sup> Müller, p. 283.

<sup>23</sup> Müller, p. 285.



as to defeat its own end, which must ever be clearness and convenience of expression. When languages become cumbersome by their case-endings or verb-tenses, they will inevitably be cut down; for colloquial language has a stronger tendency to change according to the facility and convenience of speaking, than written language has to alter its forms according to the convenience of writing. Writing, in fact, is quite an accident and a non-essential in language; and if it exercises any influence, it is in fixing forms and retarding changes; but it cannot further influence the general law by which human speech is constantly breaking out into new modifications.

Thus it is that French has almost as completely thrown off the case-inflexions of its direct prototype the Latin, as English has the less varied declensions of the Anglo-Saxon. In the place of true tenses and moods, such as *amabo*, *amavi*, *amare*, both languages adopt the aid of adjuncts and auxiliary verbs. We say, "I will love," "I shall love," "I may love," "I would have loved," &c. where *will*, *shall*, *may*, *would*, are all Saxon verbs, "I will to love," "I am bound to love," &c. So "I have loved" is "I hold as loved" (*habeo amatum*), and "I loved" means "I love-did."<sup>24</sup> We therefore (and the same is equally true of the French) express by three or four distinct words what the classical languages express by one word, *e.g.* they-would-have-love-did (loved), by *amavissent*. In French *ils auraient aimé*, 'they would have possessed-as-loved.' So, whether we say 'I did this,' or 'I did do this,' we equally mean 'I do-did this.'

If we ask why these changes have occurred, why forms in themselves shorter, and quite as capable of every shade of meaning, have been superseded by a more clumsy and verbose method, we can only reply, that it appears to be in obedience to a general law by which the same radical words are agglutinated in some dialects, and become again detached in others. Thus *amabo* is really a compound of two verbs, as *j'aurai*, 'I shall have,' is *j'avoir-ai*, 'I have to have.' The direct cause of the change was probably the necessity for a more explicit way of defining action past, present, and contingent, after the terminations of Latin verbs had been dropped by the process of word-clipping.<sup>25</sup> Thus with substantives, *caballus* (*i.e.* *caballos*) passed into 'caballo, cavallo, cavall,' and finally our slang word *cab* for *cabriolet* (*cabriolus*). So *dominus* became *domino*, and *domn* *don*.

No investigation into the theory of language can proceed far without admitting the theory of original word-roots that have existed from the very first, and have continued, often nearly unchanged, in the very latest dialects belonging to the

<sup>24</sup> See Müller, p. 233.

<sup>25</sup> Müller, p. 230.

same family. To take a familiar instance, who cannot see that our word *rain* is the same as the Greek *ῥαίνειν*, 'to sprinkle'? Yet it would be most absurd to suppose that the English word was derived from the Greek. It merely belongs to a common stock of word-roots, or, in other terms, a common family of language. It is not less certain that an early principle of language was simply to double roots. This is not more surprising or inexplicable than our practice of using (principally indeed in imitation of sounds) reduplications such as *tum-tum*, *pa-pa*, *ma-ma*, *pooh-pooh*, *by-by*, *O-ho*, *haw-haw*, *tip-top*, *dear-dear*, &c. Both Greek and Latin,—the latter of which, though much later in its written literature, retains many earlier linguistic forms than the Greek,—supply a considerable number of words which evidently arose from the doubling of monosyllabic roots. Indeed, the reduplicated tenses of Greek and Latin verbs seem clearly to have been formed on this principle, as *curro cucurri*, *disco didici*, *tollo tetuli* (afterwards cut down to *tuli*), *spondeo spo-pon-di*, &c.; and in Greek not only perfects, as *ποιέω*, *πεποίηκα*, but aorists, as *ἀγαγεῖν*, *πεπιθεῖν*, &c. These re-duplicated roots were in turn inflected or declined, *i.e.* they took pronominal suffixes; and sometimes they have a strengthening prefix besides. Thus, from a root *μα* or *μαι*, 'impulsive motion,' came a very ancient word *μαι-μα-κετος*, and, with *a* prefixed, *ἄμαιμάκετος*, 'savage,' 'furious,' literally 'having much rush-rush.' Inflect this already long word, and we find a genitive *ἄμαιμακέτοιο*, a word of six syllables, the sense of which we English, who delight in a copious vocabulary of monosyllables, could express equally well by 'fierce' or 'mad' or 'wild' or 'strong.'

Examples of double roots in Latin are, *perperam*, *marmor*, *murmur*, *tintinabulum*; but there are many more in Greek, as *πορφύρα* (root *φυρ*, 'to mix'), *ποιφύσσω* (*ποιφ*, our *puff*), *ποιπνύω*, *μέρ-μερος*, *μαρ-μαίρω*, *μερ-μήρα*, *τάρ-ταρος*, *βάρ-βαρος*, *βόρ-βορος*, *κόρ-κορος*, *έλ-ερίζω*, *άλ-άλη*. We may even triple a root in such an inflexion as *βεβαρβαρωμένος*. It is not, however, so much the composition or inflection of these old word-roots which interests the etymologist, as the tracing them through a series of words which have become extensively changed both in sound and meaning. Take as an instance the root *el* or *elee*, 'pity.' Hence the noun *ἐλεημοσύνη*, 'piti-fulness,' shortened to *almesse* (Chaucer), *awlmous*, and finally to *alms*. A remarkable example of word-clipping exists in *uncle*, from *avunculus*, where the mere diminutive termination has been retained, while the real root (*av-us*) has been wholly obliterated. So also *cousin* from *consobrinus* (*consoro-rinus*).



We will now briefly trace a few primary roots through their various ramifications in Greek, Latin, and English.

1. The root *κριν* or *cern* is seen in *κρίνειν* and *cernere*. Now *κρίνειν* is 'to judge,' and *cernere* is 'to perceive.' The former properly means 'to separate' truth from falsehood; the latter 'to separate' and so distinguish one object from another. The verbal adjectives or participles from this root are *κριτὸς*, Lat. *cretus*. Combined with *dis*, 'twice,' i.e. requiring the separation of two things, we have it in *dis-cernere*, 'to discern,' 'to descry,' and 'discrete,' which last originally meant 'separated from others,' then (in the form *discreet*) 'of superior prudence.' *Crimis*, 'hair,' is named from being *separable* into locks. *Crime* is clearly *crimen*, and the same as *κρίμα*. All these words mean 'judgment or decision;' thence the subject-matter of it, viz. a charge to be investigated by a judge, 'a crime.' Then we have 'recriminate,' to bring a counter-accusation; 'discriminate' and 'discrimination,' both from the Latin *discrimen*, which often means 'danger,' literally 'the point at which safety becomes distinguishable from destruction.' This again illustrates *crisis*, *critic*, *critical*, *criticism*, &c. Even *certus*, *certain*, is probably a transposition of *cretus*, 'that which is separated from false.'

2. The root *ol* or *el* occurs in two Greek words of great antiquity, *ὄλαι*, 'barley-meal,' and *ἐλαιον*, *oleum*, 'oil;' these two products of the soil forming probably the earliest food of man. We have the same word, rather curiously diverted, in *element*, which originally meant 'the food eaten in training-schools,' and thence the first beginnings of things physical or metaphysical. *Adolescens*, 'one growing up;' *indoles*, 'that which is ingrained in us,' 'disposition;' and *suboles*, 'that which is reared up in succession,' 'a progeny,'—are evidently derived from the same source.<sup>26</sup> *Olere*, 'to have a scent,' seems connected with the notion of food.

3. The root *fa* (*φα* in *φάος*, *φαίνω*), 'to make clear,' 'to express in words,' 'to utter,' is seen in a great many forms. Thus *φημι* in Greek, is *for*, *fari* in Latin. We have *fatum*<sup>27</sup> (*φατὸν*), 'that which is declared,' 'destined;' and *fama*, 'report,' *φήμη*, *fame*, *infamy*, *famous*, &c. From *προφήτης*, 'one who speaks in place of another,' we have *prophet* and *prophecy*, neither of which words have primarily any notion of *prediction*, but simply of vicarious delivery of a message. The Greeks used *προφήτης* of the person who announced the will of the gods to those who consulted the oracles. From the same root comes *blasphemy*, properly 'an injurious report.'

4. The root *lac* or *lak* exists in the same languages in the

<sup>26</sup> See Varronianus, p. 140.

<sup>27</sup> Prof. Müller says that *fairy* is derived from *fataria* (p. 65).

sense of 'a hole made by tearing.' We see this in *lacerare*, in *λάκκος*, 'a cistern,' in *lacus*, in *lake*, in *lacuna*, *lagoon*. Here the general idea is 'a hollow for holding fluid;' but *lacerare*, compared with *λακίς* and *λακεῖν*, shows that the original meaning was 'to rend with a loud noise,' as in the tearing of a garment, the opening of a volcanic fissure, &c. The making a hole or cavity, and the filling it with fluid, are correlative ideas. Hence *to lack* implies to require such filling. The words *lagona* and *lagena* became our 'flagon;' also *to leak*, to make a mess or puddle, has the same connexion with *lake* as *sneak* has with *snake*. This latter implies the stealthy gliding of one who wishes to escape notice, and is one of several verbs derived from the habits of animals, as 'to dog,' 'to rat,' 'to bully,' 'to ape,' &c.

We need not here remark that nothing is so fallacious, nothing so carefully to be guarded against by a true etymologist, as connecting words together by mere similarity of sound. Thus 'concrete' has nothing to do with 'discreet,' but is from *cresco*; *lac*, 'milk,' has nothing to do with the root *lac* just illustrated—it stands for *γλακτ* (*γάλα*, *γάλακτος*), the root of which is seen in *gluk* (*γλυκὺς*), *sweet*. Again, *crimson* has nothing to do with *κριν*, but is said to be an Arabic word, the origin of *kermes oak*, whence the dye was derived, as *vermilion* is from *vermiculus*, the worm or grub found in the kermes oak-gall (*coccus*).

5. From *δεμ*, 'to build,' we have *δέμειν*, *δόμος*, *domus*, and our word *dome*. From *domus* comes *dominus*, which was originally an adjective, 'one belonging to a house.' Martial seems to recognise this relation between the two words, "Non arsit pariter quod domus et dominus."<sup>28</sup> Now *dominus*, 'a lord' (when used as a title of respect only, as distinct from the Scriptural meaning, "The Lord"), was shortened in the middle ages to *domnus*. So the Compline begins with "Jube domne benedicere." This was again cut down into the Spanish *don*, as *domina* passed into *donna*. In French we have *dame*, *madame*, and *Madonna*; *demoiselle*, in Italian *damigella*, for *dominicella*, and again our still shorter word *damsel*. To this list of derivatives we may add *dominion*, *domination*, and *domineer*, as well as the French *dimanche* for *dies dominica*. How few would imagine that *Dame* so-and-so and the *dome* of St. Paul's were radically the same words!

6. The word *pend* (which does not exist in the Greek) gave rise to two Latin verbs, *pendēre*, 'to weigh,' and *pendēre*, 'to hang.' Originally these were the same; for *weighing* merely is the *hanging* of an article from a scale. So we use 'to hang' both as an active and a neuter verb: 'he hangs the bacon,' and

<sup>28</sup> Ep. lib. xi. 93.



'the bacon hangs.' In English we have the following derivatives: *pending, impending, appendage, pendulum, pendulous, dependent, independent, pension, pensioner, suspense, suspend, expend* (shortened into *spend*), *expensive, pensive*, and (from the French) our name of the flower *pansy*. *Compendious* means 'concise,' 'brief.' This word signified 'that which was weighed with another,' and thus something saved or gained, first in quantity, then in time. *Dispense* and *dispensation* meant 'the distributing of provisions by weight,' and was applied to serving out the allowance for slaves. *Recompense* is 'the weighing back again with some other,' and thence the repayment of the like sum of money or weight of goods that had been taken. *Pencil* is perhaps a different word, *penecillus*, 'a little tail,' i.e. a tuft or brush; but *pen* or *pend*, 'to hang,' may be the ultimate root.

Here, then, we have nearly twenty English words of very extended use, all derived from one monosyllable *pend*. But this is little compared to the number of English words formed from *spec*, 'to see,' of which Professor Müller enumerates about thirty.<sup>29</sup>

7. We will take one more word-root and trace its cognate meanings through the English and the classical languages; and we purposely confine ourselves to these, because such investigations become not only very long, but often quite uninteresting to those who are not versed in the other cognate dialects, ancient and modern, which might easily be brought to bear on the inquiry.

The root *ser* is seen under several forms, and perhaps first in the Homeric *ῥέω*, 'I will speak.' The lost Greek letter *F*, commonly known as the digamma, made this word *Fῥέω*. But, as this *F* had a very flexible and versatile value, *Fῥ* became, by laws well understood, *ser, swer, eir, ir, sper*. The primary sense was, 'to put together in a row.' Thus, 'to speak,' came from the idea of 'stringing words together,' just as *λέγειν*, 'to say,' and *legere*, 'to read,' meant primarily 'to pick words' by the tongue or the eye. In *εἶπειν*, 'to string,' and in *sertum*, 'a garland,' we trace this root most clearly. The rainbow, *Ἴρις*,—from the many colours of which some of our bright lilies derive their name,—meant 'the (celestial) messenger.' In Homer the word is always *Ῥίρις*. Then we have the name of a well-known character in the *Odyssey*,—*Irus*, the beggar-man; and that Homer was quite aware that this meant 'the speaker,' or 'the messenger,' he has himself told us, for he says "the young men called him *Irus*, because he used to carry messages whenever any one bade him."<sup>30</sup> Another form of the word is traced in our terms *irony, ironical*. Properly *εἶρων* meant 'a talker,' thence

<sup>29</sup> Müller, pp. 259-263.

<sup>30</sup> Od. xviii. 7.

one who boasted of or professed what he did not possess or did not in sincerity mean. Aristotle<sup>31</sup> uses εἶρων to signify 'one who conceals his real knowledge,' or pretends ignorance, and this is the *irony* of Socrates in Plato. Another similar word, used by Homer and Hesiod, is εἶρα or εἶρέα, 'a council,' closely resembling our word *parliament*, explained above.

From *ser*, 'to string,' comes *sero*, *serui*; and hence 'to insert' is to twine or tie in; 'to exert' is to put outside, *ex-serere*; thence, to exhibit prominently. A *dissertation* is a separate arrangement of words or arguments. To *sew*, to make a row of stitches. And now comes a rather interesting question: is *sero* *serui*, *sew*, connected with, or does it only accidentally resemble, *sero sevi*, *sow*? We think they are the same words, and that 'to sow' meant 'to place seeds in a row close together.' We further compare εἶρειν with σπείρειν, and ἔρμα with σπέρμα; and it is very remarkable that in a passage of Æschylus,<sup>32</sup> ἔρμα is actually used as a perfect synonym for σπέρμα. *Semen* is shortened from *sevimen*. *Sermo*, 'a sermon,' 'a discourse,' is a 'stringing together' of words; and a *series* is any thing in a continuous row. The god *Hermes* (Mercury) meant the infernal conductor of the dead, tied together in rows (like a band of slaves or captives), to the regions below. Compare εἶρερος and *servus*. Nearest, perhaps, of all existing forms to the primitive root is our verb 'to swear,' from the Anglo-Saxon *swerian*.

Some interesting considerations result from tracing the French word *parler*, 'to speak.' This, as we see more clearly in *parole*, is clipped down from *parabolare*, which primarily meant 'to speak parables.' Hence arose the meaning 'to discourse sententiously,' and so to converse generally. The medieval word *parliamentum* signified 'a talking,' then 'a place for talking,' 'an assembly for council,' a parliament. *Parlour*, French *parloir*, was a monastic word, meaning a place where the monks were allowed to converse. We use *parlance* and *parley*, imported from the Norman-French. All these words descend from παραβάλλειν, 'to put together,' to compare two facts, or use a simile, as in 'a parable.' If we go further back, and investigate βάλλειν, we shall find in it the same root as *ball*, meaning 'throw' or 'pelt.'

A rather curious word is *embezzle*. This is from *imbecillare*, 'to weaken,' 'diminish,' 'impair;' hence, to damage property by stealing. The Latin verb, again, is from *in* and *bacillum*, and involves the notion of supporting weakness by a stick. Our *imbecile* is the same word. *Idiot* meant, in Greek, 'one

<sup>31</sup> Ethics, lib. iv. § 13.

<sup>32</sup> Suppl. 573. Elsewhere ἔρμα means 'a row of stones,' 'a reef.' The π in σπείρω is a corruption of the Ϝ, or digamma.



who had no trade or profession ;' hence ignorant. But whereas we use it as a term of reproach, the Greeks, who despised trade and handicraft, often adopted it in praise, as 'a gentleman,' opposed to 'a tradesman.'

*Brave* and *bravado* are from medieval Latin *bravium*. This is a corruption of the Greek *βραβεῖον*, which meant 'a prize awarded by an umpire.'

Many familiar domestic words are of very singular derivation from, or are connected with, Greek or Latin words. *Family* is from a very old word, *famul*, 'a slave,' and is probably connected with the root *fam*, 'hunger,' i.e. 'one fed on poor fare.' *Bottle* is from *botellus*, 'a sausage,' from its resemblance in shape. *Glass* is a Teutonic word, *glesum*, 'amber.' *Canister* is the Latin *canistrum*, and the Greek *κάνιστρον*. We have the same root in *cane* and *canal*. *Cup* is seen in *κύπελλον* and *capio*. *Mortar* is from *mortarium*, which idea of 'death in the pot' arose from pounding baneful drugs, and thence drugs generally. Thus Juvenal says, "et quæ jam veteres sanant mortaria cæcos." *Mortar*, in the sense of cement, is the same word, and means 'stuff mixed together in a trough.' *Brush* is from *brusco*, the Latin *ruscus*,<sup>33</sup> or the plant called 'butcher's-broom,' because it was used for scouring and cleansing the meat-blocks. *Candle* is *candela*, 'brightness of white flame,' and is the same word as 'candid' and 'candidate' (dressed in white). *Chick-pea* is a corruption of *cicer-pisum*. *Tile* is for *tegule* (*tegula*). *Attics* from *anticus*, 'front,' as *postern* is connected with *posticus*, 'back.' *Door* is from the same root as *δόρυ*, 'a plank,' and *roof* is traced in *δοροφή*. *Chimney* is clearly *caminus*, a word as old as Homer. We might go on to almost any length ; but enough has been said to show the interest, even in matters of every-day life, which attaches to the study of etymology. All the above examples are, indeed, simple and obvious ; yet it is perhaps doubtful if they always occur to even highly educated readers.

Some further instances of word-clipping, or the cutting down of long compounds so as to bring them within the range of easy and rapid pronunciation, are the following : *creep* from *correperere*;<sup>34</sup> *axle* from *axiculus* ; *axe* from *ἀξίνη*, 'a breaker up' (though others refer this to the root *ac*, 'to sharpen') ; *moment* from *movimentum* (compare *mollis* for *mobilis*, and that for *movibilis*) ; *subtle* from *subtilis*, i.e. *subtexilis*, 'underwoven,' i.e. close, compact. *Sublime* is from *sublevimis* (shortened to *sublimis*), 'up-lifted ;' *stipend* from *stipendium* ; *desire* from *desiderare* ; *squirrel* is from *sciurellus*, 'little shady-tail' (*σκιά* and *οὐρά*). Indeed, what has been said of the Latin language,

<sup>33</sup> *Ruscus aculeatus*. See Virgil, Georg. ii. 413.

<sup>34</sup> Lucretius, v. 1219, "cui non correpunt membra payore."

that it is one which "is always yearning after contraction,"<sup>35</sup> is equally true of all the Romance languages, or those derived from it. In French we have *même* from *semet ipsum*, *aujourd'hui* from *ad diem de hoc die*, *jamais* from *jam magis*, *assez* from *ad satis*, *désormais* from *de ista hora magis*, *devant* from *de ab-ante*.<sup>36</sup>

Language must be considered to follow the same general and immutable laws which all organic creation obeys. As plants and animals, by lapse of incalculable periods of time, and by dissemination through congenial climates, appear so to have modified their original forms as now to bear a very different appearance from their extinct prototypes; so do languages, when carried by migrating hordes to great distances from their original birthplace, become by a constant succession of changes and off-shoots, unlike indeed, yet so as always to remain generically the same as they were when first imported. We therefore connect modern and ancient dialects much on the same principle as that on which certain types of the coal flora can be referred to families in the tropical flora of to-day. Again, dialectic changes are wholly beyond man's control just as all the natural modifications and varieties in organic forms are equally independent of his agency. But, as in the artificial breeding of animals and plants, man can develope, and even render more or less permanent, certain deviations and improvements from the natural type more suited to his wants, so by the artistic creations of a written literature he can do something to fix forms of words, and to reduce them to a more convenient orthography. This, however, only applies to writing; spoken language cannot be, and never has been, influenced by individual caprice or authority. All attempts to correct dialects by the standard of written literature are utterly vain. It is in the former that the vitality of language resides; the latter is but the *caput mortuum* left by the irresistible workings of the linguistic faculty in man. "Dialects have always been the feeders rather than the channels of a literary language; any how, they are parallel streams which existed long before one of them was raised to that temporary eminence which is the result of literary cultivation."<sup>37</sup>

But, it will be said, languages undoubtedly do increase. Every new edition of a dictionary boasts that it contains some hundreds of words more than the preceding edition; and some of these must be *new* words, that is, coined or invented words. This is undoubtedly true; and, what is remarkable, such words grow with much greater rapidity in old languages when they have been imported into new countries. As an instance, we

<sup>35</sup> Varronianus, p. 432.

<sup>37</sup> Müller, p. 51.

<sup>36</sup> Ib. p. 457.



might cite the large number of words which of late years we have begun to adopt from the Americans. Many of these begin to be used, no one knows how, as mere slang; and so they become more or less naturalised in ordinary conversational language. But not one of these words owes its adoption to either the authority or the literary fame of its inventor. They are picked up or rejected by the national language purely on the principle of natural selection; they become used, if they are really wanted to express a new thing or a new idea, but not otherwise. And as *slang* implies the language of the uneducated and illiterate, so the fact of most new words having been at first slang terms illustrates our position, that dialects, rather than refined and artificial or classical conversation, form the true living principle of language.

It would be interesting to investigate how far slang words involved original roots; but it is probable that in many cases they are due to what is called *onomatopœia*, that is 'word-making' according to and in imitation of natural sounds.

Language, we say, is not properly artificial; but writing avowedly is so. Now, if the authority of an individual cannot alter even received modes of spelling, *à fortiori* he can have no control over dialects. Let us take a few examples of this.

1. We have seen a printed copy of the Gospels in English, edited by a learned Hebrew professor, in which the Hebrew points were appended to the English letters, on the ground that this would form a convenient indication of the different vowel-sounds. Does any one suppose such a scheme could ever come into general use either in this country or any other?

2. Some years ago, a few very eminent scholars and essayists tried to introduce a new method of spelling some words more in accordance with their sound, *e.g.* *wisht*, *shockt*, *rackt*, for *wished*, *shocked*, *racked*. But the words are still universally spelt in their old way.

3. The adventures of a publication called the *Fonetic Nuz* (*Phonetic News*) may be in the recollection of many of our readers. This was intended to revolutionise English spelling, and to introduce a system of expressing every word exactly according to its sound. Of the success of this literary experiment we need not speak.

4. Tacitus tells us that the Emperor Claudius introduced, by his imperial authority, into the Roman alphabet three entirely new letters, viz. a *digamma* or *F* sound, an *antesigma* or *ps*, and a medium between *i* and *u*. These had the fairest chance of taking root in their new soil. Public documents employed them, and inscriptions still remain containing them. But they died a natural death. "*Quæ usui imperitante eo*," says Tacitus,

“postea oblitteratæ, aspiciuntur etiam nunc in aere publicandis plebiscitis per fora ac templa fixo.”<sup>38</sup>

If, then, man cannot alter language when he chooses, it follows that language is something beyond man's control. It is, therefore, under the dominion of natural laws, has an existence and a vitality in common with all organic nature, and is not more the invention of man than the fuel he burns or the food he consumes. It is the gift of God to man ; but then it is so only in a certain sense. It was not *communicated* to him in its perfect state, or any state at all ; but it was implanted in him in such a way that he himself became the unconscious instrument of its development.

<sup>38</sup> Tac. Ann. xi. 14.

---



## THE EVANGELISTIC SYMBOLS AS A KEY TO THE GOSPELS.

[COMMUNICATED.]

THAT the lion, the man, the ox, and the eagle, are symbols used in Ezechiel and the Apocalypse to denote the four Evangelists, is a thing pretty generally known; but, as with many other things generally known, there the matter rests. Ezechiel and the Apocalypse are hard writings, and many people may take it for granted that what is found in them only has a fair chance of being too mysterious and unintelligible to be definitely applicable to the solution of practical difficulties. Yet surely, after due consideration, it seems reasonable enough to expect, when the four animals have been fixed on as four symbols, that the character symbolised by each should be at least a marked and pervading one, and that a good proportion, at all events, of the discrepancies observable in each Evangelist should originate in the special character divinely assigned to each. We should expect, in fact, that as different animals of different make and habits are the symbols, so the Evangelists thereby signified should correspond to their symbols, not only in having specific characters, but also in having specific differences.

Whether every difference, however minute, however microscopic, can be explained by reference to the distinct character of each Evangelist is not the question. My position is this. It seems absurd to call one Evangelist a lion because there is some trifle in him that reminds one of a lion. I expect to find the features which are the objects of the symbolic representation, not exhibited only in trifles, but general and broadly marked. I do not expect an eagle to low like an ox, nor, if there happens to be any sound which they can make in common, do I by any means conclude this sound to be indicative of the same animal wants in both. Again: as man is the most imitative of animals, whichever of the Evangelists is the most imitative has a broadly marked feature, to make us appropriate to him the human symbol. That a man's voice is "heard in the desert," is a flimsy, superficial reason for thinking that it should be symbolised by a lion. It might be done as well by a wild hog, or a hyena, or an ostrich, each of which also makes itself heard in the desert. Such absurdities were pardonable in an age when the Nestorian and Monothelite controversies had not yet forced men to observe in what texts the especially intense proofs of our Lord's humanity

were to be found. It is to the honour of St. Augustine's prophetic intellect that he rejected them<sup>1</sup> before that era. But a large range of imitative power we may fairly call a broad feature belonging to man; just as to be king of the forest is one which we may fairly style a broad feature belonging to the lion.

Unless, then, the four symbols express in a clear, marked, and unmistakable manner the character of the four Evangelists, there seems to be no reasonable ground for accepting them as evangelistic symbols at all. While on the one hand it would be absurd to expect puerile and ludicrous resemblances between each symbol and its corresponding Evangelist, on the other, if there are *no* solid points of resemblance, the very adoption of such symbols would seem puerile and ludicrous. To the man who is content to say that they are mysterious, it is fair to put the question, What is the good of revealing what nobody can understand? As soon as these symbols, and their connection with the Evangelists, are recognised to be part of revelation, a strong presumption is created that each Evangelist has his own special work distinctly allotted to him from on high, and that he will not meddle with the work of the others. After the character of each is once clearly ascertained, to expect that they will interfere with each other's work is like expecting a man to fly like an eagle, or an eagle to learn reading, writing, and arithmetic, like a man. Assuredly the ultimate wish, so to speak, of divine truth, is to get itself understood, whether it speaks through symbols or without them; and therefore to assume that certain symbols are mysterious, meaning that they aim at being unintelligible, is to accuse revelation of folly, in order to excuse our own sloth. It is idle to expect to understand without the labour of attention that which the very term "mysterious" shows to be confessedly unintelligible without attention.

That there may be parts of Holy Writ intended either absolutely, or in relation to certain ages, or in regard to certain men and tempers, to be unintelligible, is quite possible. But the instance before us is not a case of this kind, if we may judge from the fact that Christian doctors and artists in all ages have assumed that these symbols were intelligible in some degree. The question is, how great an amount of intelligibility we can upon reflection assign to them, and not whether they are intelligible at all. Call them mysterious if you will; it will still be true of a mystery that it is known in part. Whether any created intellect knows the whole of any thing

<sup>1</sup> Consens. Evan. i. 9.



may surely be doubted; there are different degrees of knowing both what we do and what we do not call a mystery. But it is the part of an educated mind to endeavour to make its knowledge of what is mysterious as exact, as methodical, as exhaustive, as may be. We ought, then, to use these mysterious symbols not as mere indicators that there are four different Evangelists, but also, if possible, as clues to the anatomical differences of the minutest fibres in that body which the living character belonging to each animates and sets in motion.

In these days there are plenty of theories about the way in which the four Gospels came into being. It requires some courage to say boldly that the character of each was divinely determined upon, and was disclosed to Ezechiel several centuries before their actual existence. But my belief is that this supernatural theory of their origin is the only one which will really bear examination; that it alone not only will determine the general character of each Gospel, but will determine it so clearly as to entitle us to solve questions by reference to it; that it alone will cast a clear light upon various details which without it appear unimportant; that it claims a right to be heard amongst the many conflicting theories, and has not the least objection to confront criticism and philology; that it can offer sensible advice to those who have to decide between conflicting readings; can do somewhat towards determining between conflicting translations and commentaries; and, in fact, can hold its own, old and infirm as it seems, against all comers, theological, philological, archæological, critical, sceptical, or unbelieving. To pretend to prove all this in a single article would be absurd. I can only supply the slender proof which my limits impose upon me; but I can assure my readers that the confidence with which I speak is not the glow of a sudden passion for a new view, but the result of the reflection of several years.

Let me briefly state some of my arguments. It is clear that if I find something in an eagle's nest which either an eagle or a man may have put there, I shall leave the matter unexplored and unexplained, so long as I am indifferent to the question, How came it there? But if I assume that the eagle put it there, I shall have already taken a step which leads me to inquire, by what instinct, and with what purpose, the eagle was led to put it there. An entirely different train of thought is started in my mind if I find the same thing in a man's dwelling. I refer to different instincts and intentions altogether to explain its presence in the house, and to explain its presence in the nest. Again, if I find the print of a foot

which I can indeed just explain by supposing a lion to have passed that way, but can explain much more satisfactorily by supposing an ox to have been there, am I not, unless other circumstances interfere, entitled to refer it to the ox? Will not this, which is true of the animals used as symbols, be also true of the Evangelists symbolised? Must not that, and that only, be the right interpretation of particular and minute things in each which refers those particular and minute things to the special character of each, and explains them accordingly? For example, if I see in St. Mark a small trait which I can explain either by referring to his knowledge that Jesus was very man, or by referring to his knowledge that He was very God; if, moreover, I have determined beforehand that St. Mark is "the man,"—then I shall have no hesitation as to which of the two is to furnish the principle upon which the passage is to be explained. St. Mark's business (to express the thing logically) is to predicate man of God; St. John's to predicate God of man. These two Evangelists then (and, indeed, any two or more Evangelists) may use either the same word or phrase with perfectly different intentions, or two apparent synonyms which will cease to appear synonymous at all the moment we take the animus or intention of the author into consideration. But, in fact, when we have once fixed on a particular symbol, as best corresponding to the general features of each evangelist, the smaller and the more apparently trivial are the variations which we can explain upon such an assumption, the stronger will be the proof that we have hit upon the right distinctive character for each.

I should wish, before I come to particulars, to be sure that I have made clear the idea of four distinct characters being traceable in the four Evangelists. Let me give a few illustrations of this idea. We can imagine a purely civil distinction, quite in the natural order, to have existed between the four Evangelists. Let St. Matthew be a tax-gatherer; it will then be quite natural that he should be the one writer of the four who should tell us of Christ's paying the tribute-money. This is a broad and obvious mark of the old man in him; and when he, and he alone, tells us of *publicans* and harlots going into the kingdom of heaven before the Scribes and Pharisees, his old profession accounts for the minute fibre of this single word, as well as for his recounting the outward fact, that God incarnate paid taxes to that prodigy of unnatural wickedness, Tiberius Caesar. When we know that St. Luke had been a physician, the analogy between diseases of the body and those of the soul is too obvious to leave



us without a clue to the fact, that the cure of souls is one of the great features of the good-Samaritan gospel; and it also explains in some degree the fact that it is he alone of the four who tells us that our Lord *healed* Malchus's ear. A superficial acquaintance with scriptural phraseology would, in like manner, entitle us to assume, that the only fisherman among the Evangelists should have his business in the great deep of divine mysteries, and would also explain how it is that he only tells that the two fishes were *relishes*, ὀψάρια—a slight distinction of which a dealer in fish would be aware. What St. Mark was it is hard to say; perhaps Jews in his day, like English Catholics of old, took a second name to avoid persecution. But we may fairly make him a stranger to the Holy Land, and to that refer the awkward Roman words which he lets down, like the paralytic, upon our heads (*e.g.* σπεκουλάτωρα), and also the Syriac words (*e.g.* ταλιθὰ κουμί), which he treasured up in his memory as a foreigner might do. To these minuter symptoms of foreign origin he adds the broader token of omitting a great deal which Jewish settlers abroad would not care about. Let not pious ears take amiss this illustration of differences in the Gospels, corresponding to the civil position of the Evangelists. All supernatural graces are grafted upon a natural stock. Grace is not given to vegetables or to brutes, but to rational beings endowed with free will. The doctors of the Church have been almost, if not quite, always men of learning in the natural order. Similarly we may suppose that there was some relation between the natural and supernatural occupation of each Evangelist. Here, however, what is insisted upon is simply this—that to assume hypothetically, and only hypothetically, such a distinction in the civil position of the four Evangelists, is to furnish ourselves with an intelligible illustration of the results, general and particular, small as well as great, of bringing to bear four different minds upon one biography; for while we are considering the effects of civil distinctions of the natural order as such, biography seems the proper word to employ.

Here I may observe, by the way, that to assume that there is no such supernatural character as the four symbols indicate, is to beg the whole question about the origin of the Gospels; for while there are several theories about that origin, the theory that every variation in them is traceable to a specific character, divinely infused into each Evangelist, is worth considering.

Another illustration may be found in the symbols themselves, viewed not as symbols, but as creatures in the natural order. Certain animals are created for certain ends. Be-

tween any four species we may take, we can see certain clear resemblances and differences. But when we know or assume any end to be the special end of any one of them, we think it fair to assume that the minuter differences in each are regulated by the special end. We expect to find their bearing by keeping in mind the special end of each. A lion's claws are not made as an eagle's are; but when we know the object for which the general build of each animal has been made what it is, then we often know how to account for the differences in smaller parts. But when we do not know how to account for these, we assume that farther thought and investigation will prove that there is a real reference in them to the end for which each animal was made. A lion's hairs may differ in composition and structure from those of an ox, without our being able to assign any definite reason for the difference. The soul of each animal, probably, has a relation to its senses, and its senses to every appendage of its organs of sense, and these again to its prey and to its enemies; so that, unless we knew the whole of its bearings, we could not know the bearings of its minuter parts. Nevertheless, we may fairly take it for granted that the more exact our knowledge of the general object for which it was created becomes, the more exact also will our knowledge be of the functions of its smallest belongings. The same may be assumed *cum debita proportionem* of an Evangelist symbolised by an animal. Thus, if St. Matthew is the lion, we may assume not only that the great features indicative of spiritual jurisdiction will occur in his Gospel, but that each particular word in which he differs from the others must have, whether we see it or not, a reference to that meaning. The more perfectly we know the end for which St. Matthew was made Evangelist, and the more abundant the details which we can refer to that end, the more entitled shall we be to assume that every tittle of his whole Gospel results from the character originally impressed upon him, as much as the hairs or claws of the lion result from the soul for which his body was planned.

The comparison possible between the natural and the supernatural is the foundation of symbolism. The supernatural principle or character, once assumed or ascertained, is like the happy guess which sets a man to make an induction; the symbolic reasoning is simply and sheerly natural, like the accumulated inductive proofs which subsequently confirm the guess. The original assumption that St. Matthew is the lion may be strange, arbitrary, mystical, or supernatural; but the proofs that he is so are natural and logical. An infidel may see that the genealogy of Christ as King, or the visit of the



Magi to do him homage, suit a jurisdictional (*sit verbo venia*) better than a priestly Gospel, and may see it by exactly the same faculties as those which show him that wings suit a bird, and four legs a quadruped. The same process of thought which inclines him to believe that the smallest fibres of the eagle and lion are all referable to their original idea, will incline him to believe that St. Matthew's choice of words was influenced by his evangelistic character. Hence, though the thing to be proved may be supernatural, the first proof requires no particular supernatural discernment, but only the exercise of the ordinary reasoning faculties. A spiritual discernment may, however, be well employed in increasing the number of the subsequent proofs.

I may perhaps be allowed to give another illustration of the character which I suppose to be supernaturally impressed upon each Evangelist, and by which he is apparently still distinguished in heaven (Apoc. iv. 7). Three of the seven sacraments of the Church confer an eternal and indelible character upon the souls of Christians. It is in analogy to this to suppose that when upon four men, and four only, a special character was conferred for a special end, it was done by a kind of special sacrament, like the washing of the Apostles' feet, which was a means of cleansing grace for that occasion, never afterwards to be repeated. Such special sacraments befit the multiform graces of the Giver, and the special wants of the recipient. This idea will help us to realise the deep-lying distinction between the Evangelists. As in nature we understood that a lion's soul could not animate a horse's body, or a man's soul a woman's body; so in grace, or new nature, we may imagine that St. John's evangelistic character was as distinct from St. Mark's as the grace of baptism from that of ordination.

Let me assume, then, that each Evangelist came to his work with a definite character impressed upon him, by virtue of which he selects and assimilates those actions, modes of statement, phrases, orders of words, terms, even perhaps spelling, which accord with that character. I have shown by analogy that the thing is antecedently possible, but *πάν ὁ δυνατόν, πιθανόν*—that which is possible admits of proof. And if I succeed in my inductive proof, we shall then be enabled to contemplate each Evangelist in his own individuality, without thinking of one copying from another; we shall have no need to harmonize conflicting statements by violent processes; we shall substitute for the old and effete line of defence against Julian and Porphyry, and similar unbelievers, a mode of harmonising the narratives which is free from the violent pro-

cesses of making different things "substantially" the same; and it will furnish us with something much better than weapons of defence, namely, with means of contemplating our Lord in four different and distinct portraits, all equally true, though taken from different points of view.

There is one preliminary objection which ought to be considered before I enter on my proof. Men will not object to my saying, in a vague and sweeping way, that the Evangelists are what they are because the Holy Ghost chose to make them so. But those who think that an original Gospel, now lost, or a chaos of tradition, or doctrinal prepossessions and aims, or other natural principles, are enough to explain every variation of the Gospels, will be apt to object to my whole theory in some such way as this. "The works of God in the supernatural order," they will say, "stand in the same relation to His works in the natural order as the products of nature to the products of human art. Now if I can account for the stone-knives of the gravel-drift (for example) by human agency, I am bound to do so, and not to call in nature. Just so, if I can explain the genesis of the Gospels on natural principles, I am bound in reason to do so, and not to call in supernatural ones. But you tell me to begin by assuming a supernatural cause for the difference between the Evangelists, and to fit my facts to your theory, when I am already furnished with several natural theories, which, together or separately, sufficiently explain the facts. But in such a case it is as unreasonable to have recourse to the supernatural as it would be to ascribe the Pyramids to nature."

To this I reply, first, that no natural theory of the formation of the Gospels can be based exclusively on the facts supplied by the Gospels themselves; and secondly, that all such theories do in fact call in the aid of coeval traditions. But my theory is not only based on such a tradition, namely, on the very ancient application of the four animals to the four Gospels, but also on a prophecy which preceded the Gospels, generated or confirmed the tradition, and helped it to determine that there were these four Gospels and not more. The naturalists cannot expect me to renounce the aid of tradition till they have done the same. If the Gospels were ushered into the world with a prophecy, they came into existence with a supernatural mark upon them, which was fixed there, not by me, but by tradition. It will not be fair to set tradition aside when it favours my supernatural theory, and to call it in again when it aids your natural theories. Men's convictions about the origin of the Gospels are seldom or never deduced from the Gospels themselves, but from the concurrence of a previous



hypothesis, traditional or otherwise, with the induction of the Gospels. My plan is similar ;—to accept hypothetically the tradition that exists, not to argue about its possibility or impossibility *a priori*, but to see how it fits the facts. Take this instance. There is a tradition that St. Matthew's Gospel was first written in Syriac. I suppose it to be so, and examine what light it throws on the Greek, and its various readings. I find that in chap. xxvii. v. 34, there are two readings of one word—wine, or vinegar, *οἶνον* or *ὄξος*. In Syriac the words for the two are so much alike, that a very natural confusion of letters would have easily occasioned the two readings. If case after case like this could be shown, any critic would be satisfied of the truth of the tradition which he had at first taken on trust, and he would thenceforth treat it as an historical fact, even though incapable of historical proof. This is what I do. I accept upon trust a theory of prophetic parentage, and therefore supernatural ; then I try whether it will explain facts as well as or better than the natural theories. I do this on the common principles of induction, without once adverting to any thing supernatural or mystical. All the supernaturalness is confined to my first traditional assumption, and has nothing to do with my subsequent proofs. To tax the assumption as a fanatical absurdity, because it is supernatural, is to make the far stranger assumption that the supernatural is a mere chimera.

I must claim indulgence if, for brevity's sake, I sometimes call each Evangelist by the name of his symbol. The symbols in themselves are apt for this purpose. The ox is the sacrifice, and so the proper type of the priesthood ; if it seems awkward or disrespectful to state what is recorded in the priestly Gospel with this formula, "the ox states it thus," we must remember that all language applied to divine things falls short in dignity, and only ceases to be in one aspect ludicrous when it ceases to be novel. As St. Luke is the ox, so St. Matthew is the lion, St. Mark the man, and St. John the eagle. But after we have gained this clear view of the specific character of each Evangelist, we may ask, How is it, if St. Luke is the ox, that not only things bearing on our Lord's priesthood are found there, but also things that do *not* so bear, which ought not to be found there? If the theory fails in its negative tests, the positive tests are of no value, and the theory is insufficient to give a sacerdotal turn to debatable matter. Now upon this theory, why should the sacerdotal Gospel appropriate the detailed account of the Annunciation and subsequent events, or that of the Bloody Sweat, instead of the human Gospel of St. Mark? Again (to pass over things like the

*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*, which are related by both the Lion and the Man) how is it that the Eagle alone gives us the account of the acquittal of the adulteress, which, as an act of jurisdiction, ought to have been appropriated by the Lion? Why, again, are some miracles, which surely are works of *divine* power, not only not in the Eagle's Gospel alone, but in all four, in three, in two, or even in the Man only?

This objection can receive at present only a provisional reply. It will be weakened in the course of my proof of the special character of each Evangelist; and when that proof is complete, I hope to be able to give the solution of each of these difficulties. Now I only observe that prominent features, in apparent discordance with a given character, are often found to be natural emanations from it. Thus Aristotle tells us that it is characteristic of a man who has received a benefit not to like to meet his benefactor. If this is the case with natural characters, *a fortiori* we may expect that supernatural characters will put forth effects which cannot, without reflection and experience at least, be shown to be in accordance with that character. I do not pretend in this essay to show how all difficulties against my theory can be removed by reasons in the natural order; but how the positive proofs of it, deducible from the Gospels themselves, do, to a great extent, fall within the natural order, and not the supernatural.

As a concise example of the kind of proof to which I refer, let us examine the predicates which each Evangelist gives to Joseph of Arimathea; in other words, let us look at Joseph from the point of view of the Lion, the Man, the Ox, and the Eagle. St. Matthew, the ex-taxgatherer, who tells us how hardly the rich will enter into Christ's kingdom (xxvii. 57), informs us that Joseph was wealthy. Next the Man (Mark xv. 43) speaks of his good looks,—he is “a good-looking senator” (*βουλευτῆς εὐσχημὸν*). In the same way hagiology dwells upon the personal beauty of many of the saints, and the Western Church has ever ascribed it to our Lord. Thirdly, we do not expect a priest to reveal people's secret faults, but to die rather than to break the seal of confession. So St. Luke talks of Joseph as a good man and a just, without a word about the shabby sort of faith which he had, a faith which did not confess our Lord before men. But fourthly, the Eagle remorselessly drags to light this hidden weakness: Joseph is a believer, but secretly, for fear of the Jews. For St. John speaks as if standing in God's stead, who alone has the right of altering that distribution of life, property, or reputation, which He has made. Hence in this divine Gospel so many characters are taken away, just as here the half-faith



of Joseph is stigmatised. Now let me show the value of this kind of proof by a familiar example. If I suspected that four men were respectively a doctor, a lawyer, a priest, and a banker, and found, in hearing them describe a pickpocket, that each of them dealt in phraseology derived from the profession which I suspected to be his, it would be a strong confirmation of my supposition. It is this kind of circumstantial evidence that I shall attempt now to detect in the four Gospels, to enable us to confirm our suspicions of the connection of each Evangelist with his proper and indelible character or symbol.

Let me, then, proceed to set down some of the characteristics of St. Matthew, taking first certain broad features, and afterwards some smaller ones, which appear to result from his symbolic character. In spite of the authority of those few fathers who appropriate the lion to Mark instead of to Matthew, I shall follow the common tradition, because the whole tissue of the first Gospel, woven as it is of "jurisdictional" passages, proves beyond doubt that the king of the forest must be Matthew's symbol. The following things are to be found exclusively in his Gospel. St. Peter is appointed the Rock on which the Church is built, and told that the gates of hell, the antagonist kingdom, shall not prevail against him. He is taken outside the Holy Land, the old kingdom of God, into Cæsarea Philippi, where this fact is announced to him; as if the very place was meant to suggest that his kingdom would interfere with that of Cæsar, as a Church which christianises slaves, and makes the marriage-tie indissoluble, cannot help doing. He is, however, commanded to pay tribute to Cæsar for "Me and thee," for Christ and himself, for Principal as well as for Vicar. The commission to make disciples of the whole world, given in this Gospel alone, asserts the universality of the jurisdiction. Specimens of the way in which our Lord used this jurisdiction are given in the decision between the respective merits of Sodom, Gomorrha, and Tyre, and those of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum; in the division between sheep and goats; and in that between the wise and foolish virgins. The resurrection of the old saints after the Passion is mentioned only by the Lion, and it is a token of our Lord's jurisdiction over the dead as well as over the living (see Rom. xiv. 9). As the commission to teach all nations finishes this Gospel, so does the royal genealogy begin it. The first person mentioned after Jesus is David the king. The eight beatitudes, and indeed the whole sermon on the mount, mark the main characteristics of our Lord's kingdom. The eight woes of the Scribes and Pharisees are the curses of those who resist His kingdom. The phrase "kingdom of heaven" is almost

exclusively St. Matthew's. It bespeaks a ruling body and hierarchy, which the phrase "kingdom of God" does not explicitly assert. The parable of the king's wedding-feast has the same bearing; as also that of the labourers sent into the vineyard, and rewarded by the steward with a certain arbitrariness; that of the drunken steward and his punishment; that of the talents; that of the tares and reapers; those of the treasure, the pearl, and the net; the similitudes of the kingdom; that of the king and his debtor; and that of the obedient and disobedient son. In St. Matthew, the Magi do homage, and the antagonistic jurisdiction of Herod is evaded. The connection of the kingdom with the angels is set forth (xviii. 1-35), and forgiveness of injuries is constituted a condition of entering it. The laws for the soldiers of the kingdom, in their warfare with the kingdoms of the world, are given in x. 16-42. In xxiii. 2, our Lord limits the jurisdiction of the Scribes and Pharisees to the things taught from the chair of Moses. In c. xxvii. Judas gives testimony to his Master's innocence, and Pilate bears public witness to the same effect. In one chapter all nature suffers with its King, and in the next we have the Jews' attempts to throw discredit upon the Resurrection, the seal of our Lord's power. These are certainly clearer tokens of royalty than that for which the Lion has been appropriated to St. Mark,—the cry in the desert, with which the second Gospel begins. But the minuter symptoms are as clear. One of these is the word "debts" in St. Matthew's Lord's Prayer on the mount. "Debt" includes all penalties for all sin, temporal and eternal, those remitted in confession as well as those remitted by the jurisdictions inherent in Pope and Bishop, but not in priest. Hence in the Lion's prayer we have "debts," in that of the Ox, "sins." Again, St. Matthew records that Caiaphas rent his official robe (*ἱμάτιον*); St. Mark, that he rent his tunic or shirt (*χιτῶν*). St. Matthew says with judicial decision, "Who-soever shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, either in this world or in the world to come." St. Mark, with friendly admonition and information, "Who-so-ever shall blaspheme the Holy Ghost, never hath forgiveness, but is liable to eternal judgment." In the Lion's Gospel, Salome asks a share in Christ's kingdom for her sons; in the Man's, a share of the glory wherewith they had seen our Lord's human nature transfigured. In the Lion our Lord commands the fig-tree to wither; in the Man He says, "let no one eat of thee for ever." This human craving is often present to St. Mark. In the Lion (xix. 2) the multitudes follow Him as their leader; in the Man (x. 1) they assemble



round Him (*συμπορεύονται πρὸς αὐτόν*) as a man. In the human Gospel the details of the death of St. John Baptist, the friend of the Bridegroom, are lingered over with human affection (c. vi.); in that of the Lion the account is cut short (c. xiv.). Such details as the *χοῦν* for the *κονίορτος*—the dirt instead of dust which the Apostles in St. Matthew shake from their feet; the ointment poured on our Lord's head "while He was reclining" in the posture of a master, with the woman in the slave's place at his feet, the preciousness of the ointment, the weight of *βαρντίμου* in St. Matthew, the indefiniteness of *πολυτίμου* in St. John, and the reckoning of *πολυτελοῦς* in St. Mark,—are minutiae which it would require too much space to go into thoroughly.

Let me now turn to St. Mark for the characteristics of the human Gospel. The Man, the most imitative of animals, goes forth, sometimes imitating the Lion, sometimes the Ox, but never the Eagle, who soars too high for him to follow. Rare indeed are those passages in which St. Mark offers the slightest appearance of agreeing with St. John, and examination shows that in those passages it is only appearance, and not reality. He views even the same things in an entirely different light. St. Mark tells us that our Lord was in the desert with the wild beasts, and thus compares him to Adam, yet sinless, to whom it was given to rule over the beasts. The Man paints our Lord as man. When Simon, and those who were with him, "hunted out" (*κατεδίωξαν*, i. 35) our Lord, they said to Him, as if He were moved by the common human motives, "all men are looking for Thee." Two or three times He is represented (i. 45, and iii. 9) as if pestered by the crowd; and once he orders His disciples to have a boat always ready to enable Him to escape it. The familiar name "Boanerges" is mentioned only by Mark; it is eminently human to give such nicknames to favourites, not to point out their official position, but to throw light on their characters. St. Mark alone (c. iii. and c. vi.) complains of having nothing to eat, as he alone records our Lord's words to the fig-tree—"let none eat of thee for ever." The little parable of the man who sowed, and slept, and could not understand how the seed grew, is so human that the other Evangelists omit it. He alone (c. vii.) details the human traditions about washing vessels, or the retirement of our Lord with a few of His disciples, after the death of St. John Baptist, according to the Jewish custom of mourners. Our Lord asks questions in such a way as to seem not authoritatively demanding, but humanly seeking, oftener in Mark than in the others. Thus (iv. 13), "Do ye not know this

parable?" and ver. 30, "With what parable shall I compare it?" ver. 40, "Why are ye such cowards?" viii. 12, "Why does this generation look for a sign?" ix. 21, "How long is it since this befel him?" ver. 33, "What was it ye were talking about, one with another, on the road?" v. 9, He says to the fiend, "What is thy name?" "Legion," is the answer, "for *we* are many." Here the answer implies a tone of ignorance in the questioner which it does not in St. Luke. v. 39, "Why do ye fret and weep?" viii. 17, "Have ye your hearts yet hardened?" and the rest. ix. 50, "With what shall it be salted?" x. 3, "What did Moses command you?" Mark also speaks of His marvelling at unbelief (vi. 6), of His being astounded in the agony (xiv. 33), of His not knowing the day of judgment (xiii. 32). He records those miracles which were performed with circumstances by no means necessary for the miracle, but, like the rites and ceremonies that accompany the sacraments of the Church, intended as aids to the imagination of man (viii. 22). He too records our Lord's inability to do mighty works in a certain place (vi. 5); His looking upon a youth, and loving him (x. 21); and His looking upon others in anger (iii. 5). I should be too long, and too theological, if I were to show how our Lord's bodily and local presence seems to occur to St. Mark as the cause of His miracles, rather than His divine and omnipresent power. We cannot expect broader features of distinction in a Gospel confessedly imitative, where the actions of the man are also those of the King and Priest. St. Mark is that young man, whom he himself describes, with the linen garment—the garment of the king and of the priest—cast around his naked body. When the misbelievers seize him, they get hold of what he has borrowed from the royal or the sacerdotal Gospel; while the man, the real character impressed upon him by the Holy Ghost, escapes from them, and leaves them their empty prize.

I can hardly speak of the Gospel which concerns the Priesthood of our Lord without encroaching on theology more than I have a right to do when I only profess to show the biblical student the broad evidence of the correspondence of each Gospel with the symbol allotted to it. I have only a right to expect biblical knowledge in my readers, which is no more theology than a knowledge of landscapes is botany. St. Luke begins with setting before us the last days of the Jewish priesthood, and its sacrifices, with their angelic attendants,—the announcement of the birth of the priest of the old system, who was to be the precursor of the High-Priest of the new,—the Virgin, assured of the conception of the former, and asked



to give her assent to the conception of the latter,—the shepherds who worship the new-born pastor,—Simeon, who holds Him in his arms, and recognises in Him τὸ σωτήριον, the saving sacrifice (as, in the Vulgate translation, does also the Blessed Virgin in the “Magnificat,” *salutare meum*). In the Temple, the one place of sacrifice, does Jesus linger, preferring Latria to God before Dulia to his parents, and clinging with a kind of priestly affection to the stammering heralds of His own sacrifice. The first unction (vii. 45) of our Lord’s feet is connected with His priestly absolution. The greater part of chapters ix. to xviii. is occupied with matter recorded only by St. Luke. Our Lord is on His way to Jerusalem, the place of sacrifice, when the heretical Samaritans refuse Him hospitality. He takes occasion to inculcate the poverty and detachment incident to the priesthood, the missionary duties of the seventy, the perils of those who refuse to receive them, the force of exorcism, and the superiority of what His priests saw to that which the prophets of old could see. The good Samaritan, a type of Himself, the repentance of the Ninivites, the obduracy of the rich, the blood which Pilate mingled with the sacrifices of the Jews, the fitness of the Sabbath for cures, the parable of the prodigal and penitent, and the rich and impenitent, of the unjust judge (to inculcate perseverance), and of the publican and Pharisee (to inculcate humility in prayer),—are all found in these chapters, which thus become as it were a handbook of the pastoral office. The Ox appropriates those things which seldom come home to the laity, except through the priesthood, but never to the priesthood through the laity. Here the priest may study the helpless, the *habitué*, the penitent through privation, and the impenitent through enjoyment, the good who grows tired of praying, and the half Christian who smites his breast humbly, but makes no restitution—materials for a whole moral theology, clearly meant for those who have the cure of souls. After our Lord has been to Jerusalem to sacrifice, then we hear of Zacchæus’s complete penance and restitution. St. Luke alone unmistakably distinguishes the Christian sacrifice from the Paschal Lamb and chalice. He alone gives those words in which Catholic divines see the institution of the Sacrament of Orders: “Do this in remembrance of Me.” In this first Eucharist the priest had prayed for His Vicar upon earth, that his faith might not fail (xxii. 32). The Bloody Sweat has its own marked relations to the priestly office, which it would not suit these pages to explain. The ejaculations during the Agony, as St. Luke puts them, savour more of the Lord’s Prayer than they do in the form adopted by Lion or Man,

and suit well with that Gospel, which oftener than the others tells us of our Lord's praying. In St. Luke only is our Lord tried before Herod, the Jewish prince, the type of those who keep the Christian profession in unrepented sin. Of the seven last words, three belong to St. Luke. The first of these absolves the crucifiers ("Father, forgive them"), the second absolves the penitent thief, and the third commends His own and all dying men's souls into the Father's hands. St. Luke is probably the "other disciple," who alone records our Lord's second Mass at Emmaus. He alone mentions the private interview vouchsafed to St. Peter after the Resurrection, doubtless to absolve him after his denials. Let me add an instance or two of minuter variations peculiar to St. Luke. In the account of the Transfiguration there are three such. He tells us that our Lord was *praying* at the place, that He spoke of His *exodus* or going forth without the camp to be sacrificed (Heb. xiii. 12), and that two *men*, Moses and Elias, talked with Him. In his accounts of the Resurrection and the Ascension, two *men* appear again; these we need not identify with angels, they may again be Moses, the institutor, and Elias, the purifier, of the Jewish priesthood. In the Temptation St. Luke says that Satan departed, not absolutely, but *ἄχρι καιροῦ*, till his opportunity should come at the Passion. With Luke (viii. 12), the Devil is Diabolus, the calumniator; with Mark, he is Satan, the fiend or foe; with Matthew, the Wicked or troublesome one. In Luke those who have no root lose the faith, apostatise (*ἀφίστανται*), instead of being simply scandalised. He tells us why the candle is lighted, that those who come in, by the ministry of the priesthood, may see the light. He frequently uses Master, *ἐπίστατα*, for Rabbi, or overseer of a synagogue. In Mark v. 7, the fiends conjure (*ὀρκίζω*) Christ by God, looking on Him as man. In Luke viii. 18, they beseech Him, as one having sacerdotal power to exorcise them. In raising Jairus's daughter, only in St. Luke does our Lord take the priestlike precaution of making the father and mother accompany the three disciples. In St. Luke ix. 23, the cross is to be taken up *daily*, as if an additional obligation was laid on the priest, beyond that laid on the Christian and layman in Matthew and Mark. In ix. 28, he counts as eight days what the other Evangelists count as six, for the Sabbaths were no-days to the laymen, days to the priest. In ver. 44 he has emphatically, "lay up these words in *your* ears"—"for" the Son of Man is going to be betrayed. It is the priest's duty to keep this knowledge, in order to set forth to the people Jesus crucified. In the palm-procession we learn from Luke



alone that it was *disciples* only who composed the multitude that shouted for "peace in heaven, and glory in the highest," the hymn of the High-Priest entering into the Holiest. In xix. 49, our Lord was giving *the* daily discourse in the Temple (*ἡν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, i.e. δίδαγμα*). In xx. 16, he only has the "God forbid" after the prophecy of the vineyard being given to others, as if he alone recorded the confidence of the Jewish priests in the permanence of their temple and sacrifices, whose destruction our Lord goes on to prophesy. In xx. 34, the priestly Evangelist alone makes the distinction, "the children of this world (the laity) marry and are given in marriage." In xxi. 4, the widow's mite and other alms are cast among the *gifts* to God, *τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ*. In ver. 24 our Lord prophesies how Jerusalem, the place of sacrifice, shall be trodden down by the Gentiles; and on His way to the cross, when He turns and sees it and its daughters, He once more blesses those who are not given in marriage, as He remembers the sack of the house of sacrifice. At last, just before the Ascension, St. Luke's Christ, like a priest, blesses His disciples at parting. In St. Mark He is *taken up* after talking with them, in St. Luke He is *carried up* into the sky.

But I must omit the rest of these minutiae, or I shall tire the reader; so I will pass on to the fourth Gospel. It is as easy to identify St. John with the eagle as St. Luke with the ox. Indeed, so plain are the marks that his is the divine or theological Gospel, that I need only remind my readers of the number and explicitness of his statements concerning the Holy Trinity, while I here address myself to other and less obvious proofs of the fact. Our Lord's first miracle, the transubstantiation of water into wine, exhibits both the operation of the Divine power, and the influence of the Mother of God in moving it. The conversation with Nicodemus connects baptism with the presence of a Son of Man who *is* in Heaven as God. The conversation with the woman at the well not only exhibits the Divine foreknowledge, but also the new legislation about the places of sacrifice, and the abolition of the exclusive privileges of Jerusalem. The nobleman's son is not healed by our Lord's bodily presence or touch, as in the miracles of St. Mark, but by His word from a distance. The miracle at Siloam is also consummated at a distance from the fount of power. The man cured at Bethesda is admonished to "sin no more," for God has a right to tax people with sin as the cause of punishment. But when the Jews want our Lord to allow men to form like judgments of individuals, He refuses to permit them (ix. 2). In c. vi. the greatest of all miracles,

the Eucharist, is foretold with the utmost distinctness. In this chapter, as in c. x. and elsewhere, the phrase I AM is remarkable, as implying that Jesus is as no person who is not God as well as man can be. In St. John only do we find "Before Abraham was I AM." The raising of Lazarus, a work of more premeditation and effort than any other miracle, evokes another I AM (xi. 25), and exhibits a resurrection of the four-days-old corpse, as if to condemn those who disbelieved in the resurrection after three days. It is also thought by many to be full of mystical teaching on the sacrament of penance. The institution of the Sacraments, being a divine work, is especially dwelt upon by St. John, either by direct teaching or by remote allusion. When Mary Magdalene anointed our Lord's feet the second time at Bethany, St. John says that the whole house was filled with the odour of the ointment, and that she was to keep it till the day of our Lord's burial. St. Mark tells us of a woman who breaks the box, instead of keeping it, and pours it over His head, and that the disciples, not Judas only, complain of the waste. I imagine that these were distinct unctions: the sweet ointment to be kept for the burial would typify extreme unction; the other, the sacrament of Orders. Only St. John gives us the long discourse of our Lord after He had instituted the Eucharist. Only he records the I AM which threw our Lord's captors to the ground, and the private examinations before Annas and Pilate. It would take me too long to show why the three "last words" recorded by St. John befit the eagle, or why this Evangelist so solemnly gives his testimony to the flow of blood and water from our Lord's wounded side. All this would oblige me to enter into theological discussions which would be out of place here. It is next to impossible to find many minutiae peculiar to St. John, because he records so few things common to the other Evangelists. But I will mention that the expression "My Father," which abounds in St. John, is not to be found in St. Mark, and is commonly qualified with "heavenly," or "who is in heaven," in St. Matthew; whereas St. John speaks of the "Son of Man who is in heaven." In St. John God glorifies men; in the others man glorifies God. St. John reckons by the divine calendar; he uses the word 'feast' seventeen times; the three others together use it eight times. Other instances will be given in the sequel.

After this evidence of the specific character of each of the four Evangelists, and of the way it accounts for his peculiarities, let us take a difficult point, and see what light is thrown upon it. It is very strange that in quoting so noto-



riously public a document as the title on the cross no two Evangelists agree together. Their discrepancies are as strange as if one had told us that our Lord had five wounds, another four, a third three, and a fourth one or six. Now, without going into the question whether there was only one title or more,—whether St. John's title is not Pilate's autograph written in the judgment-hall, and objected to on the way by the priests; whether a provisional title was not put up by the soldiers till Pilate's answer to their remonstrances came, when it was exchanged for what he dictated;—without entering into this question, we shall be able to see that, in accordance with the characters proved to belong to them respectively, St. John would have read the title, whatever were its exact words, as a mockery of our Lord's divinity; St. Matthew, as a sarcasm on His jurisdiction and power; St. Mark, as a jest upon the man; and St. Luke, upon His priesthood. This is no God, it seems to say to St. John, but only "Jesus the Nazarene, the King of the Jews." "This," this thing hanging here, it seems to St. Matthew to say, "is Jesus, the King of the Jews," the one who would put himself on a level with Cæsar. St. Mark only reads, "the King of the Jews;" an insult on the man and on the nation; the chief, the flower, forsooth, of these turbulent barbarians. Suppose Æschylus had made Jove write over the head of his Prometheus bound, "the benefactor of mankind," it would have read as a keen sarcasm on the humanity of Prometheus, on his manhood, and his fellow-feeling with man. Just so did the title read to St. Mark. St. Luke saw in it only the denial of that office and unction which was to be the character of the Messiah. "This," forsooth, "is the King of the Jews," that great priest and prophet and king whom they are all expecting. Thus we see a special and individual character, corresponding to the different functions of the lion, the man, the ox, and the eagle, in the different title given by each Evangelist. They read in a different tone. We lose all disposition to coerce the four titles into identity, taking that which is common to all, "the King of the Jews," as the nucleus, and arbitrarily selecting from the rest the special words we choose to consider historical. The Evangelists cease to look like men of slipshod memory, who are content to give the reader a general idea that something or other, at all events, was predicated about the King of the Jews in a notoriously public title, written and exposed to view at the most stupendous moments in the history of the universe.

Let me now apply the same ideas to the narratives of the miracle of feeding five thousand men with five barley-loaves

and two small fishes, and try whether the leading and glaring variations of each Evangelist may not be referred to his special characteristic. My proof will be neither exhaustive nor mathematical; the latter is not possible in the matter at all, nor the former without dissertations too long for my present purpose. In recording this miracle, we may fairly expect the eagle to have his eye fixed on that sublime worship of God which Jesus came to establish, neither on the Samaritan mountain alone, nor in Jerusalem only—the new sacrifice. The passover was a eucharistic sacrifice, and at this feast the great eucharistic sacrifice was instituted. The former was a type of the latter. When the miracle before us was wrought, St. John tells us that “the passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand” (vi. 4). The miracle itself possibly consisted in giving the five loaves a thousand new localities, thus paving the way to that miracle of all miracles by which the true bread makes Himself present in myriads of places at once. Hence He first “lifts up His eyes,” and sees what number He has to feed, before He exerts His divine power to confer on the five loaves their real presence in so many different places. Next He tempts Philip. Both God and Satan are said to tempt, and the word seems to mean the same in both cases—it is in both to expose a person to danger. But Satan does it with one animus; Almighty God, if I may say so, with another. None but He has an inherent right to tempt, because none but He can infuse interior strength to stand under temptation. He tempts to give His creatures occasion to rise, not to fall; and besides this intention, He has the power to contribute all that is wanted for that end. St. John, then, who has to describe Jesus as God, alone ascribes to Him this active tempting. Again, he alone names Philip as the author of the remonstrance, and Andrew as the one who half-sneeringly announced that there were five loaves and two fishes to feed the multitude with—making clearer, by the contrast of their want of faith, the presence of the Object of faith. The word *εὐχαριστήσας* finds a place only in St. John, who thus becomes the author of the name Eucharist. He only records as a precept (“gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost”) what in the others is a fact. And this precept finds its counterpart at the end of every eucharistic sacrifice now offered by the Catholic priest.

With the Eagle's Gospel that of the Man is most easily contrasted. St. Mark alone says in direct words, “they have nothing to eat.” We have twice before seen him refer to his human craving. He makes some of the other Apostles take up Philip's assertions, and ask Jesus, as if almost His equals,



Are we to go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give it them to eat? He alone makes Jesus ask, as if in human ignorance, not as though with the temptation of the Divine Searcher of hearts, "How many loaves have ye?" He tells us that Jesus ordered the men to lie down in companies and companies, and that the men did lie down in beds or parterres (*πρασιαί*) of an hundred or fifty each, "so that a child might write" their muster-roll (see Isaiah x. 19). The round numbers of the other Evangelists are thus broken up, and made to tell graphically on the imagination. Both the record of this arrangement, and the command which occasioned the arrangement, seem to be accommodations to human weakness. Even the singularly unusual feature of the Man and the Eagle agreeing to record the division of the fishes to all (Mark vi. 41; John vi. 11), serves to show the difference between them. The Man says, "The two fishes also He distributed to all." He contemplates all of them as equally the recipients of the alms of a human compassion. The Eagle, on the contrary, looks at them rather as men with their free will to use as much as they would of the grace offered them by Providence, "and likewise of the relishes as much as they would." "Of the Good Spirit," says St. Austin, "our nature was created capable through its own free will." St. Mark alone specifies that fragments of the fishes as well as of the loaves were put into the twelve baskets. If we reflect upon the precise typical relation which the two fishes were ever considered to have to that sacrament which is always multiplying the presence of the Sacred Humanity, illustrated by the Jewish tradition which makes *yinnon*, "he shall be multiplied," a word of the same root as *nun*, a "fish," a name of the Messiah,—we shall be compelled to acknowledge that here is a point to which the theory before us does not seem to apply. But, as M. de Maistre shrewdly observes, the theory which explains every thing whatever, is too perfect to be true in moral matters.

To come now to the Lion's peculiarities. He only (xiv. 16) has the words "They have no need to go," and "Bring them hither to Me." Both sentences have an air of command about them. St. Luke's account has nothing peculiar to himself in substance; in collocation there is this. In ix. 13, he makes the disciples first say, "We have not more than five loaves and two fishes," and afterwards (not before, as the other Evangelists) to add, "unless we were to go ourselves and buy victuals for all the people." Thus St. Luke adds a second act of unbelief, after the Apostles have discovered that there is matter which our Lord might multiply. If He had not yet

performed such a miracle, yet the priestly Evangelist expects the Apostles to recollect that our Lord had already reminded them of Elias and the meal. When they saw the loaves, and recollected the miracles that Jesus had already done, St. Luke hints that they might have believed Him capable of doing what Elias had done. The record of this unbelief is one which well agrees with the priestly Gospel.

I may also briefly call attention to the special character of each Evangelist, as exhibited in his omissions. The Eagle omits to say that Jesus looked up to the sky (*οὐρανὸς* in the singular). Jesus could do so as man, as king invested with delegated authority, but not as God. The Eagle also omits to mention the wish expressed by the Apostles, that Jesus would send the multitudes away. For to John, Jesus is the omnipotent God, and how can He send them from His presence? The proportion of the loaves to the communicants is noticed by all; but the Priest states the number at five thousand before the men lie down, because he consecrates according to the number to be communicated; the Eagle, after they have lain down, because God foresees,—“He Himself knew what He would do.” The jurisdictional Evangelist counts up his communicants after all is over, like a priest with jurisdiction at Easter. And the Man does the same, rejoicing, as a layman might rejoice, that there were so many. All of them preserve the *ὥσεί*, *about* five thousand. It is not easy to say why, though it suggests to me a remark of general application.

It is clear that one and the same act may be an act of jurisdiction, of humanity, of priestly power, and (in our Lord's case) of divine power. He is the antitype of Melchisedech as king, man, and priest in the three first Gospels, and is Melchisedech's God in the fourth. Consequently we need not be surprised if all four Evangelists occasionally record the same thing in the same words, though they do so very rarely, if ever. Also, as the priest is man and the king is man, it will follow that St. Mark must often in words, though never in intention, be like St. Luke or St. Matthew, but scarcely ever in words, and never in intention, like St. John. Thus *ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, “He looked up to heaven,” has a perfectly different tone when the Lion uses it of the Master of angels and elements, the Man of the humble and dependent humanity, or the Priest of the Mediator in things pertaining to God.

Hence it is either idle, or wanting in discrimination, or ignorant, to look upon the Evangelists as four witnesses giving evidence to an unbelieving world, and to rejoice at every piece of verbal or substantial agreement amongst them. They never



meant their Gospels to be read in this way. Each has his own special business with Christians, and has nothing whatever to do with unbelievers. "Non crederem Evangelio nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas," is the saying of the believing Augustine to the unbelieving Manichæans (c. Ep. Fund. 46).

It may not be amiss here to try how our rule applies to passages apparently quite irreducible to its sphere. I can hardly select a more crucial instance than the celebrated pericope of the adulteress, which was once excluded from so many manuscripts. I will not ask my readers to believe before proof that this passage may have any reference to the Blessed Virgin in her character of Mother of God. But they will own that *if* it has such reference, then it is in place in St. John's Gospel. The hypothesis might also suggest a reason why Satan tempted transcribers to leave it out; and we need not think with St. Austin that the owners of the codices were afraid their wives would turn it to bad account (de Conj. Adult. ii. 9). I will attempt to show that the passage *may* have borne this reference, and, as a consequence, that many things which do not seem at first sight to be in character with the Divine Gospel may yet really be so.

In that passage, then (c. viii.), there are evidently present two parties: one violently opposed to our Lord; all the members of this party go out and leave Him apart with the woman. The other party is described as more believing (v. 31), and, as we see from v. 12, must be conceived to have remained after the violent party had gone out. Yet even this moderate party hinted, as the ancient Fathers report, that Jesus was born of fornication; the emphatic *we*, *ἡμεῖς*, in v. 41, proves this to have been in their minds. There is no difficulty, then, in supposing that the violent party were quite ready to accuse the Mother of Jesus as an adulteress. Hence perhaps they meant to put our Lord on the horns of a dilemma. If He upset the law of Moses, he would be stoned as a blasphemer; if he confirmed it, they would stone His Mother. The real adulteress was of no consequence, and not the real object of the hatred and zeal of the Pharisees. And our Lord's zeal in defending her arises not only from His compassion for sinners, but also from His filial love for the Refuge of sinners, who alone perhaps of all the children of Adam can find no one to condemn her, even falsely, in the Judgment. Thus the passage *may* easily refer to one whose mysterious conception of her Divine Son awakened even the suspicions of Joseph. If it stands in contrast with a historically existing hatred to the radical pri-

vilege of the Mother of God, this is abundant reason why it should be in St. John's Gospel. And if this is conceded, I may also conclude that many other things which may seem very unlike the specific character of any Evangelist may nevertheless prove to be very conformable to it.

I will now address myself to another notable specimen of apparent deviation from the specific character,—St. Luke's long account of our Lord's infancy, which would seem to belong so much more naturally to the Man's Gospel. Fortunately St. Austin (de Cons. Ev. i. 69) has given in a few words, on which much might be written, a key to the connexion of the Ox with this matter: "There the sacraments of the first priesthood are related as fulfilled in the Infant Christ. There, too, several other things may be diligently noted which make it plain that what St. Luke aimed at had relation to the character of the Priest." It is certain that our Lord partook of some at least of the sacraments of the old law. They promised, if they did not, like our sacraments, convey, the grace they signified. But they could not make any of their promises good without a Mediator. Hence there must have been some acts of that Mediator, the foresight, or rather eternal intuition, of which induced God to confer the promised gifts on those who before Christ received the Jewish sacraments worthily. Some acts of our Lord in the days of His flesh must have been the meritorious cause of whatever efficacy there was in these sacraments. Now no acts can be more naturally selected for this purpose than those whereby the Saviour of all Himself partook of the Jewish sacraments, not as man, because He needed them, but as priest, because they needed Him. As St. Austin says, "*Sacramenta primi sacerdotii in eo impleta narrantur.*" We have in the beginning of St. Luke, first the Jewish priesthood and offering; then the Baptist promised to it; then the conception of the Baptist, the brightest ornament of the Jewish, as the other John was of the Christian, priesthood; then the contact of the two priesthoods at the Visitation; then the Magnificat, with its expectation of a Sacrifice (*salutare*) that shall feed the hungry; then the birth and circumcision of the Baptist, with the Benedictus, and its promise of the removal of those sins which prevent the participation of the Christian sacrifice; then the shepherds come, and find our Lord swaddled as it were in the accidents of the Host, and proclaiming from His manger that He is to be Food; then His circumcision; then His first visit to the only place where divine worship by sacrifice was lawful. All these things, when meditated over by the Christian, will assuredly appear not to belong to Christ



simply as He is man, but as He is the Priest who perfects the old sacrifices and institutes the new one.

There are many other instances in which a similar appearance of deviation from the special character of each Evangelist is observable, and in which we must go beneath the surface before we can find out how such apparent deviations are only apparent. But to clear up all such difficulties would be to write a commentary upon the whole Gospels, not simply to state a theory about them in an essay. My desire here has been to show the antecedent credibility of the opinion, that creative power conferred upon the four Evangelists quite as clearly marked and definite a character in the supernatural order, as it had upon Lion, Man, Ox, or Eagle, in the natural order. Each order no doubt has had, and will have, its own Darwins, whose theories will captivate men, but only for a time, till a new opinion replaces the one they have invented.

The theory which I have attempted to illustrate is old; it is put forward by St. Austin in the passage to which I have referred. But I do not think that it has ever been thoroughly and unflinchingly worked out. It has not been taken as a lantern the rays of which could be thrown through the magnifying-glasses of modern biblical philology into the remoter recesses of the Gospel. Modern developments in doctrine, the freedom of thought which they confer on those who receive them, modern devotions, the aids of lexicons and concordances, the facility of comparing printed books when contrasted with the difficulty of comparing rolls, harmonies of the Gospels, the light thrown on them by polyglotts, by travels, and by antiquities,—all assist us to make a use of this theory which would have been difficult, if not impossible, in the days of the Fathers. The huge incubus of various readings, which now makes the entire text of the Gospel so difficult to decide upon, would perhaps be less perplexing if a leonine reading was always preferred for the Lion, a human reading for the Man, and so on. The conflicts of commentators would often be peremptorily decided by the clear and unmistakable voice of the tribunal of this theory. We should not have Fathers on this side and Fathers on that, taking as it were special retainers from theological partisans, who often plead as if there were no judge at all in the tribunal. Any one of them who contravened this ancient oracle might be looked upon as a majestic utterer of beautiful truths, but as a commentator would be held of little account. The chances, indeed, are that no one man could command the full scope of patristic, scholastic, dogmatic, and biblical knowledge requisite to enable him to produce a full and minute commentary based upon such a

theory. But if the attempt were once made in a genuine spirit of submission to the Church, in an honest horror of frigid adherence to the mere words of the holy Fathers, with a fervent attempt to grasp their living spirit, and in its flame to fuse together whatever scholastic, philological, or other learning could be brought to bear on the subject, we should then have the beginning and foundation of a commentary on the Gospels which would elicit from them proofs hitherto unobserved of the infallibility of the whole scope of the Church's teaching. While I think, rightly or wrongly, that this would be the result of an attempt to regenerate our present unsatisfactory commentaries through the aid of a venerable tradition, I trust that my readers will forgive me if, in candidly propounding that opinion, any thing either harsh or fanciful, either inexact in facts or erroneous in doctrine, should in their judgment have escaped from my pen.

---



# CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

1. *Thebes; its Tombs and their Tenants, ancient and present; including a record of Excavations in the Necropolis.* By A. Henry Rhind, F.S.A. (London: Longmans.)
2. *The Iliad, Book I.* In English Hexameters according to Quantity. By John Murray. (London: Walton and Maberly.)
3. *Iliadis Carmina XVI. Scholarum in usum restituta.* Edidit Arminius Köchly. (Leipzig.)
4. *The Choëphoræ of Æschylus, and Scholia.* Revised and interpreted by John F. Davies, B.A. (London: Bell and Daldy.)
5. *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina.* Recensuit P. Hofman Peerlkamp. A new edition. (Amsterdam.)
6. *Zur Geschichte des Kopernikanischen Systems.* Von Dr. Franz Beckmann. (Peter: Brannenberg.)
7. *Relations politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Ecosse au XVIe siècle. Papiers d'état, pièces et documents inédits ou peu connus, tirés des bibliothèques et des archives de France.* Publiés par Alexandre Teulet, archiviste aux archives de l'Empire. 5 vols. (Paris.)
8. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon, including all his Occasional Works:* newly collected and set forth in chronological order, with a Commentary biographical and historical. By James Spedding. 2 vols. (London: Longmans.)
9. *A Memoir of Sir Philip Sidney.* By H. R. Fox Bourne. (London: Chapman and Hall.)
10. *Histoire du Père Ribadeneyra, disciple de St. Ignace.* Par le Père J. M. Prat, S.J. (Paris.)
11. *The Journal and Correspondence of William (first) Lord Auckland.* Edited by the Bishop of Bath and Wells. Vols. III. and IV. (London: Bentley.)
12. *Memoir of Charles Gordon Lennox, fifth Duke of Richmond.* (London: Chapman and Hall.)
13. *A Few Notes from Past Life, 1818-1832.* Edited, from Correspondence, by the Rev. Francis Trench, M.A., Rector of Islip, Oxford. (Oxford and London: J. H. and J. Parker.)
14. *Life in the Forests of the Far East.* By Spenser St. John, formerly English Consul-General in Borneo. 2 vols. (London: Smith and Elder.)
15. *Vacation Tourists, and Notes of Travel in 1861.* Edited by F. Galton. (Cambridge: Macmillan.)

16. *Psychological Inquiries*. By Sir B. Brodie. Second Part. (London: Longmans.)
17. *Essays on Scientific and other Subjects, contributed to the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews*. By Sir Henry Holland, M.D. (London: Longmans.)
18. *Sermons preached at the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, New York, during the year 1861*. (New York: Hugot and Howell.)

1. The manner in which modern discovery has dealt with the sepulchral relics of Egypt reminds one of the old story of the Rosicrucian vault, into which, as the unhappy excavator advanced, an armed figure seated at the coffin rose and shattered into a thousand pieces the lamp which had been illumining for centuries the secrets of the grave. It is true that many remarkable objects have been discovered which, had it been possible to have left them *in situ*, would have rendered it comparatively possible to obtain a connected view of the development of ancient Egyptian belief in some of its most interesting fields. But they have been dispersed over the museums of civilised Europe; no record has been preserved of the circumstances of their discovery, of the position, or often even of the localities in which they were found, and they have thus become, in some respects, merely tantalising curiosities. Mr. Rhind has done his best to find out some tombs which had been hitherto untouched, and to describe, before it should be too late, the exact phenomena which they presented. His search has been less successful than his great industry and perseverance merited, yet he has certainly obtained a few very curious and important results; and the process of depredation has been going on from so remote a date that this limited success ought to content the modern investigator. As Dr. Davis lately found at Carthage that the ruins must have been carefully searched even before the close of the Roman period, so the richly-stored sepulchres of Egypt tempted the cupidity of times which to us are ancient, but are recent indeed when compared with the primeval antiquity of Thothmes I. or Amunoph III. Mr. Rhind refers to a papyrus translated by Letronne, dated under Philometor and Euergetes II. (180 to 116 B.C.), "in which an official owner of tombs, called there a Colchytus, complains to a Theban magistrate that one which was his property had been broken open and rifled." When we recollect the extent to which the Egyptian religion was adopted by the Roman conquerors,—"sacrorum sacrilegorum quibus tota fere Romana nobilitas inspirabat populo jam et omnigenum deum monstra et Anubem latratorem," is the expression of St. Augustine (*Conf.* viii. 2), 300 years after Juvenal had satirised the superstitions,—we may well suppose that even in Roman times Egyptian relics must have been in sufficient request to make spoliation frequent. Since then, there are proofs extant that the same destructive agencies were more or less at work in the Middle Ages; and of late, with the increased interest in Egyptian antiquity, and the increased facilities



for travelling, they have gone on with greater rapidity. The lamentable zeal with which Lord Elgin stripped the metopes of the Parthenon has been to a not inconsiderable extent exhibited in Egypt by such illustrious explorers as Champollion and Lepsius, who may justify themselves perhaps by the insecurity of the monuments in a barbarous country, though they increase the confusion amidst which the records can at best be studied. This state of things makes the conscientious exertions with which Mr. Rhind sought to discover and describe an intact sepulchre the more meritorious and important. His operations were carried on during the winter and spring of 1856-57 in the Necropolis of Thebes, where he caused a part of the ground to be excavated, the difficulties of which were likely to have deterred former explorers. The choice proved so far fortunate that a sepulchre was found containing the sarcophagus of a Theban dignitary of the date B.C. 9, with all appurtenances undisturbed, though, what is remarkable, the sepulchre chosen for the last resting-place of this personage had belonged, ages before his time, to other occupants, whose remains had been dislodged at some period not ascertainable. A few of the more interesting particulars are as follow. After many weeks of labour, a doorway was uncovered in the face of the rock, plastered with clay, impressed in rows with a large seal bearing an *oval*, which exhibited the name of King Amunoph III. This doorway, however, contained an aperture, which led Mr. Rhind to anticipate rightly that this sepulchre had been rifled in earlier times. The tomb was a large rectangular chamber, forty to fifty feet in each direction, with six square rock pillars supporting the roof. At one of the inner corners there was a sunk passage leading to another vault, which had also previously been opened. The floors were strewn with bones, fragments of mummy-boxes, and mummies, their wrappings ripped up along the throat and breast. Among the rubbish were found fourteen small wooden tablets inscribed with the names of princesses of the family of Thothmes III., who died towards the close of the sixteenth century B.C. These tablets, which are of a kind commonly attached to bodies, cannot, however, Mr. Rhind thinks, indicate the actual sepulture of princesses of such rank, as the other arrangements were of inferior kind, but may have belonged to dependents of the royal house. After this rather disappointing result, further clearings having been made along the same face of rock, another doorway was at length exposed, and entrance effected into a chamber eight and a half feet broad, eight feet high, and fifty-five feet in length through the rock. The walls were plastered with clay; and about half way in the chamber stood a singular object, a sort of funeral canopy of wood, painted in bright colours, and in perfect preservation. Mr. Rhind has given a beautiful facsimile of this very curious catafalque. Near it were four fractured stones, cut in imitation of viscera vases, with heads of the genii of the Amenti; and a double statue in limestone, two feet high, with inscriptions showing that it represented a military officer attached to the police of the temple of Amun-ra

at Thebes, with his sister. This too was broken; so it is plain it belonged to the earlier occupant of the tomb. Mr. Birch refers it to the eighteenth or nineteenth dynasty. There were also two amphoræ, and a large clay platter with dry mortar. There were, besides, discovered two passages diverging from the chamber, and another opening, secured by a massive wooden door, locked, and built up half its height with large stones. On searching the passages, two cells were found, not of large size, and containing mummy-cases all in confusion, which had evidently been previously rifled. A coarse terra-cotta lamp was lying about, with blackened nozzle and wick half exhausted, the light of which had aided the plunderers of this sepulchre perhaps 2000 years earlier. Lastly, the massive door, which had not been opened since the days of Augustus Cæsar, was cleared and unbarred. It opened on a tunnel, nearly six feet in height, and cut through the rock for seventy feet. There were two cells at its sides, which had been rifled like the others; but it terminated in a shaft twenty feet deep, above which there was a structure of strong beams, with ropes suspended over them, which had no doubt served for the operation of lowering the dead into their last abode. On descending into this shaft, the explorers found six chambers, extending, two of them crosswise, and three longitudinally, in each direction from the shaft. Of these, four were, comparatively speaking, of less interest. In one there was a large mummy-case containing the remains of a man and of a young girl, the latter with bracelets of bronze or copper, and anklets and an ear-ring of the same, whitened with silver or tin. Above the knees of the mummy-case, on the outside, were the bodies of two very young children. But the mummy-case itself had evidently belonged originally to some much earlier occupant. The lid had been wrenched off; the wooden slips which had secured it had been torn away. By the side of this mummy-case was a deal box containing an undecorated mummy. Evidently the dead who here reposed had not been persons of distinction. But in a chamber fronting the shaft there was a much more remarkable discovery. There lay in it a massive sarcophagus of dark granite, unpolished. Beside it lay the rollers the workmen had used in moving it. These were made of the fragments of older mummy-cases in the style of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. There was a tall jar at the doorway of this vault filled with nuts of the Dom palm; at the head of the sarcophagus the body of a small dog, much like an Italian grayhound, a mummied ibis, a small model of a hawk made of folds of linen gummed together, and a ball of bitumen of three or four inches diameter, in which was embedded a coiled snake. All these Mr. Rhind refers to the symbolism of the Egyptian religion, and understands the dog to represent Anubis, to whom was assigned the function of guiding the departed soul from the present life to the next; the ibis, Thoth, who recorded for Osiris the deeds of the deceased; and the hawk, Horus, who ushered those who were saved into the presence of Osiris. The snake was sacred to Amun. Such was the singular spectacle which



revealed itself under the stalactite-covered vaults. On removing the lid of the huge sarcophagus was found a mummy covered, above and all around, with bitumen, which had been poured hot into the sarcophagus, which was entirely filled with it. On carefully peeling this from the outer wrappings of the mummy there was found on the head of the body a circlet of gilt copper with eleven bay-leaves of thin gold attached to it. The outer cloth of the mummy was painted a diagonal pattern of the earlier style, though Mr. Rhind says it appears to have been popular in the Greek and Latin period. Imbedded in the bitumen were small plates of gold, some in the shape of winged scarabæi, and various emblems of vitreous composition. On the left side was deposited a large ritual, which, on examination by Mr. Birch, was proved to be of great philological importance, not being an extract from the well-known Book of the Dead, but compiled from other sources, and ending with the "Book of the Lamentations of Isis," consisting throughout of a bi-lingual version, demotic and hieratic. It also contained details concerning the history of the deceased, from which it appears that his name was Sebau, that he held certain offices in the royal household; that he was the son of Menkara, a captain of soldiers in Hermonthis, lord *repa-pa*, monarch and governor of the city, and priest of the local deity Mentu or Mars, lord of Hermonthis. He was born on the 28th of the month Athyr, in the 13th year of the reign of Ptolemy Philopater III. (B.C. 68); died in the 21st year of Cæsar (Augustus) at the age of fifty-nine (B.C. 9); and was embalmed from the 10th to the 26th of the month Epiphi. In one of the chambers adjoining the vault in which this mummy was found was a case containing the mummy of the wife of Sebau. Here too was found a papyrus corresponding to that attached to the body of the husband, and containing the names and genealogy of the deceased, with an abridged version of the Lamentations of Isis.

Such is the most remarkable of the discoveries which rewarded the pains of Mr. Rhind. But, after all, so laborious a pioneer of Egyptology ought neither to be disappointed nor to fail to meet with his deserved praise, if he had done little more than save his successors useless trouble. For example, he tells us that, having dug at every available spot in the Bab-el-Molook not already searched, he is reasonably confident that no more sepulchres except those already known exist within its limits; whilst he recommends the Western Valley, which illness prevented his exploring, as probably containing any royal tombs of the same series yet to be disclosed.

His investigations in the Theban necropolis have furnished him with a starting-point for an interesting discussion on the general view to be taken of the Egyptian system of sepulture. He argues throughout on the inadequacy of the materials we possess to form a basis for any safe theory on the subject. The imperfection of much of the common embalming; the comparatively small extent of the practice, if we consider what the population of Thebes must have been; the rifling of the tombs even in ancient times; and the doc-

trine of the metempsychosis, which much perplexes the relation of the human soul to its human body so carefully preserved ;—are all of them elements in the case which embarrass the inferences commonly made from mummification as regards Egyptian belief. So far as Mr. Rhind throws out any opinion, he would refer the predisposing conditions of the practice to the antiseptic properties which might have been noticed in the sand of the desert, and to the necessity of rock sepulture to avoid interment in the corrupting alluvial soil. He also lays much stress on the traces which begin to be discovered, that the Egyptian system of religion was one which underwent a considerable process of development. It is to be expected that this will become more apparent the more we study the subject. It is always the infancy of knowledge which lumps together ages as stationary. Even China (witness the interesting work of Mr. Meadows on Chinese civilisation) has had its growth, and undergone a long series of changes. The China of antiquity will be no exception to the rule. We can but notice a curious chapter on Egyptian metallurgy, treating of the singular absence of iron in the relics; and another on the modern Egyptians, who form a sort of natural appendix to any treatise on old Egypt, like the Romaic race in connection with their Hellenic predecessors.

2. If there is any thing in the law of fashions, we should say that the ambition of successfully translating Homer into so-called "English hexameters" can only be accounted for on that principle. The last five or six years, probably, have added to our poetical literature nearly a score of these performances, fragmentary or otherwise. A wordy controversy has even been carried on as to the possible success or inevitable failure of the English hexameter. We fear we must rank with the advocates of the latter view.

The whole question may be stated in a very few words, as it seems to us. Greek and Latin verses were constructed on the principle of fixed syllabic quantity, and not of accent, except in so far as the two were identical. English hexameters are necessarily constructed solely on the principle of accent, and not of quantity, simply because *quantity* is a property wholly unknown to the English tongue. Mr. Murray's own translation, professedly made on the laws of *quantity*, is the best possible proof of the non-existence of the thing itself. He does, indeed, modify his statement in the preface, that "the present version will be found to conform to the ordinary rules of Greek prosody; and in about seventy per cent of the verses no such license [of lengthening short and shortening long syllables] has been found necessary."

Were this statement strictly true, it would still follow that thirty per cent of the verses contain false quantities. Now a single false quantity in a real hexameter destroys it: it ceases to be an hexameter at all. Do what we will, we *must* write English hexameters by accent only; that is to say, we *must* build them on a *totally* different principle from the ancient. Can, then, success be expected? We say



nothing of the novelty of the rhythm, to which an English ear takes some time to get familiarised,—nothing of the quaint and pedantic style forced upon the author by the necessity of being literal,—nothing of the general fact that every translation, in prose or in verse, must be very far inferior to the original. But to show what a delusion is the idea of English quantity, we will take half-a-dozen of Mr. Murray's verses, opening the pages quite at random. We light on p. 13, and copy the first six verses:

“Marvelling Achilles turns on his heel, and there recognises  
Pallas Athene's self, whose eyes full blazing on his shone.  
Hastily then spake he, winged words to the vision addressing,  
Wherefore appears't thou, child of Jove, great holder-of-Ægis?  
Wouldst thou view Agamemnon's insult, proud son of Athene?  
Hear then what to me seems most likely to be the result of 't.”

Here the first verse contains two gross false quantities, viz. an initial dactyl made up of four syllables, two of which are long by position, and arbitrarily made short by being slurred over; and a final dactyl and spondee forced into the service by making *rēcognises* have the *o* short before *gn*, and altering the received accent of the word, which is *rēcognises*.

It would be just as easy and just as legitimate to use the word in quite a different quantity, *e. g.* “he went to *rēcognise* *Peleüs*.” Granting, perhaps, that *marvelling* may be made *marv'lin'*, and *blazing* clipped into *blazin'*, how can we say the *a* in *addressing* or *appearing* has any right to be short? The sixth verse is only metrical by the sacrifice of the necessary accent on *me*. In good English we say, “hear what to *me* seems,” &c. But Mr. Murray makes *whāt tō mē* a dactyl.

We cannot say that, apart from the question of metrical or measured feet and syllabic quantity, Mr. Murray's verses have always an easy or agreeable flow. They often seem forced, constrained, and prosaic, and something like a “crib” or English prose version arranged in lines of a given length. This, perhaps, is not the fault of the author, but arises from the insurmountable difficulty of the task. In lines like the following (p. 16) there is little of poetry and less of pleasing flow:

“Thus, they twain, one another reviled with sharp accusation,  
Wrangling, till by the ships of Achaia dissolved the assembly.  
Peleus' son to the tents and ships symmetric'ly [!] moulded  
Goes, Patroclus attending him off with the rest of his own folk.  
Meanwhile launched Atreides a fleet bark into the salt sea;  
Twenty the rowers were he appointed, a whole hecatomb shipped,  
Due to the God, and embarked Chrysēis blooming of features,  
Leading her in, then goes as captain crafty Ulysses.”

Were every quantity, as far as that is possible, syllabically observed by an English translator,—and this would be a process of incredible labour,—the result would not be one whit more satisfactory. English must still be read solely by accent, and the ear would fail in

all cases even to notice whether *by position* a syllable was really long or short.

The discussion on the best mode of translating Homer presents many further features of interest. It cannot be too often repeated, that no version, whatever be its merits, can do more than produce some faint and weak reflection of the original. Whoever wants to *know* Homer, must still read him in the Greek, after the translators have taxed their powers to the utmost. It is difficult to analyse the charm which Homer exercises on the ear and mind; but what has been said on the subject by the Oxford Professor of Poetry seems to be throughout substantially just. One chiefly notes the simplicity, the straightforwardness, the rapidity, and, as Mr. Arnold says, the grand style. An equally pervading and constant impression, as one reads, is of the smoothness and exquisite music of the diction. *Smoothness* does not exactly express what one feels; that may represent the absence of all that is harsh and jarring, so seldom obtained in our rough northern tongue, but there is a sense of positive sweetness, an æsthetic contentment, in the form of the thought which no single term that we can think of will convey.

Rapidity and music,—these are the salient points of the impression produced by the Homeric form. With regard to the latter quality, we have little to say. It seems to be dependent mainly on two things:—on the more vocalic constitution of the Greek language, by which those terrible aggregations of consonants, with which English abounds, are avoided, and on the free use of the epic license, by which, in a large number of words, syllables could be lengthened or shortened at the poet's pleasure, and an additional syllable or two be inserted or appended, to suit the exigencies of the metre. When *πολέμουν* and *πολέμοιο*, *εἰρύσσαντο* and *ἐρύσαντο*, and a thousand other double or treble forms were open to the poet's free choice, it is clear that Greek in Homer's day, like English in the time of Chaucer, was in a condition of fluidity to which the rigid forms of the English of the nineteenth century afford no parallel. This fluidity, it is equally clear—the language being originally and intrinsically beautiful—renders that musical property of which we spoke more easy of attainment.

Perhaps it has not been sufficiently considered upon what the Homeric rapidity depends. It seems to be essentially connected with the fewness of the words in the Homeric line. We have counted the words in a considerable number of lines in the *Iliad*, and found the average number to be between six and seven—nearer seven than six. It would be easy to give reasons to account for this—such as the number of compound epithets, the peculiar formation of the Greek participles, and the license of elongation before referred to. But the fact is so, and it sufficiently explains the rapidity of Homer's verse. For each word represents, if not a distinct idea, yet some modification or conditioning circumstance of an idea; in proportion, therefore, to the number of words in a line, the mind has more to attend to, and is impeded, in the rapidity of its passage, from one set of conceptions to another. This is the psychological explanation



of the connection of rapidity with few words in poetry. The æsthetic explanation, if we may so call it, is still more obvious. Even if the division of the line into many words instead of few involved no loss of smoothness, caused no importation of impeding and retarding consonants, still the breaks in the line are multiplied—breaks which the eye cannot overlook in reading, nor the imagination in conceiving, nor even the voice wholly slur over in reciting; and a slower movement is the result. One feels that εἰ δέ κε could not be pronounced in the same time as αὐτίκα, though each dactyl contains the same number of consonants. But in a language like English, the multiplication of words involves a farther loss of rapidity, owing to the general character of our monosyllables and short words. A large proportion of them so bristles with consonants, that more words generally imply more rough voice-impeding sounds, and a proportional retardation of movement.

Now how stands the case with English hexameters? An examination of a considerable number, taken indiscriminately from Dean Hawtrey, Longfellow, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Clough, and Mr. Herschel, shows that the average number of words in an English hexameter is between eleven and twelve. This seems to us to amount to a demonstration of the unfitness of that metre to represent Homer. If it be granted that rapidity is one of Homer's essential characteristics, that no translation which fails to preserve this can be an adequate rendering of the Homeric poetry, and that this rapidity is essentially connected with the fewness of words in his lines, it follows that to translate him into a metre the lines of which contain nearly twice as many words as his lines, must be a mistaken proceeding.

We do not say that it is absolutely impossible to lessen this average in the English hexameter. Mr. Clough, whose early death literature and friendship have so much reason to deplore, when the poetic passion was at white heat within him, wielded the hexameter with a force to which we know nothing comparable in any modern language. For a reason that will presently appear, we quote the following lines from "The Bothie of Toper-na-fuosich:" they describe the revulsion, the rush of tenderness, which took possession of the maiden's heart when her lover, repelled by her apparent coldness, had ceased to sue:

"And the passion she just had compared to the vehement ocean,  
Urging at high spring-tide its masterful way through the mountains;  
That great water withdrawn, receding here and passive,  
Felt she in myriad springs her sources far in the mountains,  
Stirring, collecting, heaving, uprising, forth-out flowing,  
Taking and joining, right welcome, that delicate rill in the valley,  
Filling it, making it strong, and still descending, seeking,  
With a sweet fore-feeling descending, ever-more seeking,  
With a delicious fore-feeling, the great still sea before it:  
There deep into it, far, to carry and lose in its bosom  
Waters that still from their sources exhaustless are fain to be added."

In these beautiful lines let the reader particularly remark the

comparative fewness of the words, and the vehement rapidity which is the result. In the fifth line there are but five words, a small number even for Homer. The last two lines drag a little; yet, even including these, we have an average of between nine and ten words only for the whole passage. Could Homer be translated into hexameters at this rate, the objection that I have raised would lose nearly all its force. But it were idle to expect that any version likely to be made will have as a whole a more rapid flow, and be less encumbered with words than, for instance, Dr. Hawtrey's fragments, in which the average is eleven words. Translation is not so eminently genial a task as to make it conceivable that the translator of Homer could succeed through a long poem in forcing from the English language a rhythmic flow which exceeds its ordinary and natural capabilities, and which, even in original poetry, has been very rarely attained.

Let us now consider English decasyllabics from the same point of view. The number of words in the line in Pope's version averages between seven and eight, just one more than in Homer. This near approach to correspondence goes far to indicate that, so far as success is possible, a translation in decasyllabics is more likely to succeed than any other. At least, it shows that about the same degree of rapidity is natural to both, the shortness of the decasyllabic structure being compensated by the slight excess in its average of words. If, then, the English hexameter, for the reason given, necessarily fails in representing the Homeric rapidity, what shall we say as to its power, relatively to heroic or blank verse, of reproducing the Homeric music. To our feeling, it fails in this still more utterly; and chiefly for this reason, that the character of Homeric verse is dactylic, while, from the number of its little words, and the plethora of consonants under which it labours, the English language is most unsuited to the production of melodious dactyls. For one such line as

“Merrily, merrily, shall I live now,”

can be brought fifty such as

“Through the wood, through the wood, follow and find me,”

which, indeed, is more harmonious than the generality of our dactylic lines. The staple of any probable version in English hexameters would be dactylic, after the fashion of Mr. Herschel's line,

“Say, have they granted him too an unbounded license of insult.”

Now, without wishing to lay too much stress on syllabic quantity, and fully conceding that our ears are so tyrannised over by the accent, that we accept without flinching much that to a classic ear would have been utterly barbarous, we yet maintain that such dactyls as, “Say, have they,” and “license of,” are intolerable, and that the frequent occurrence of their congeners would render the version which they adorned irretrievably unmusical. On the other



hand, the iambus, the characteristic foot of our decasyllabic verse, is eminently suited to our language; it best conceals its defects, and is attainable in tolerable purity of sound to the extent required. Such lines as,

“Unworthy sight! the man beloved of Heaven,” &c.

do really satisfy the ear, and can be multiplied with little difficulty. We maintain, then, that not only the rapidity, but the music, or rhythmical grace, of Homer can be more faithfully represented in decasyllabic verse than in hexameters.

The question remains, what kind of decasyllabic verse? blank verse, the heroic couplet, or some form of the stanza? Could we secure a Shakespeare for our translator, blank verse would probably be most free from objection of the three. We know of no passage in all the range of English poetry more thoroughly impregnated with the best qualities of the Homeric manner than the following lines from *As you like it*:

“But whate’er you are  
Who in this desert inaccessible,  
Under the shade of melancholy boughs,  
Lose and neglect the creeping hours of time;  
If ever you have look’d on better days;  
If ever been, where bells have knoll’d to church;  
If ever sat at any good man’s feast;  
If ever from your eyelids wiped a tear,  
And known what ’tis to pity and be pitied;  
Let gentleness my strong enforcement be:  
In the which hope, I blush, and hide my sword.

*Duke.* True is it that we have seen better days,  
And have with holy bell been knoll’d to church;  
And sat at good men’s feasts; and wiped our eyes  
Of drops that sacred pity hath engender’d;  
And therefore sit you down in gentleness,  
And take upon command what help we have,  
That to your wanting may be minister’d.”

Here are rapidity, rhythmic charm, simplicity, directness, and nobleness; and all in the highest degree. But again we say, we must look to what is probable and conceivable. If blank verse can attain to this elevation, it can also sink to the prosaic depths which we observe in Young, and even in much of the writing of Thomson and Wordsworth; a fall which, as Mr. Arnold truly says, is impossible for the hexameter. Any probable version in blank verse would be certain to contain ten lines which would cause no pleasure, for one couched in the same strain as those just quoted.

To the objections urged by the Professor of Poetry against the Spenserian stanza we fully subscribe. The difference in form between stanzas and continuous verse is a radical one; and it is hard to see what is gained by diverging *needlessly* from the form of the great original. We also assent to the force of what has been advanced by the same authority as to the comparative discontinuity

caused by the closer connection which the rhyme establishes between the lines which it couples, disconnecting them in so far from the lines which precede and follow. We admit that the heroic couplet is not so perfect a metrical form as the *Greek* hexameter; we only maintain that it is a far more perfect one than the *English* hexameter; and that no improvement on Pope's version, taken as a whole, is ever likely to be effected. We say that the readers of Pope who cannot read the original experience, not by any means the same, but an *analogous* elevation and exhilaration of thought to that which the readers of the Greek experience; and we do not believe that these effects will ever be produced to the same extent by a version in a different metre. We will conclude by citing a few lines, which are not among the very best, but, being vigorous and free from carelessness, will exemplify the sort of impression which Pope's version, as a whole, is competent to produce. It is Juno's reply to the suggestion of Jove about Sarpedon:

"Then thus the goddess with the radiant eyes;  
 What words are these, O sovereign of the skies  
 Short is the date prescribed to mortal man.  
 Shall Jove, for one, extend the narrow span,  
 Whose bounds were fixed before his race began?  
 How many sons of gods, fore-doomed to death,  
 Before proud Ilium must resign their breath;  
 Were thine exempt, debate would rise above,  
 And murmuring powers condemn their partial Jove.  
 Give the bold chief a glorious fate in fight;  
 And when th' ascending soul has wing'd her flight,  
 Let Sleep and Death convey, by thy command,  
 The breathless body to his native land.  
 His friends and people to his future praise,  
 A marble tomb and pyramid shall raise,  
 And lasting honours to his ashes give.  
 His fame ('tis all the dead can have) shall live."

3. One of the most remarkable characteristics of the present age is the tendency (we will not assume that it is always an irrational or groundless one) to throw doubt on the genuineness of ancient documents, which have hitherto been received almost without suspicion. The Homeric controversy, indeed, is by no means new. There has existed for a long time a school of critics who have contended, on internal evidence, that the *Iliad* cannot have been the original work of one man. And yet the evidence, historically speaking, seems to be all on the other side; the Greeks themselves, writing not more than four hundred years after the date they assigned to Homer, considered him undoubtedly the author of the *Iliad*. And all agree that there is a certain general unity of style and narrative, a definite tendency of causes to work out ends, and a consistency of character in the principal heroes, that seem difficult to be reconciled with the theory of a series of ballads of separate authorship afterwards united by a master mind into one. When, however, we consider (1) that Greek poetry must have existed cen-



turies before Homer, since no individual could have *created* a language so adapted in all its inflexions and expressions for poetry; (2) that, if so, poems must have been extant even in Homer's time; (3) that the very idea, use, and profession, not to say the very meaning of the word *rhapsodist*, implies the itinerant reciter of popular ballads, and not the composer of wholly new themes, which thenceforth start into complete and perfect existence; (4) that various ancient monuments tend to prove that the so-called Trojan war was the one great event of the old world, and the general theme of chivalrous ballads at the time of the struggle between Europe and Asia for power, wealth, and civilisation; (5) that it is highly improbable that a long poem, believed never to have been committed to writing at all till the time of Pisistratus, nearly four hundred years after it was known, should have been handed down orally, without addition or material alteration; (6) that the immense changes in the language itself during so long a lapse of time, and the several critical recensions, as by Pisistratus, by Aristotle, by the Alexandrian critics, must have tended extensively to introduce alterations; (7) that the recitation of the so-called Homeric Iliad by so many different rhapsodists, so many rival *Homeridæ*, in so many different places of Europe and Asia, must have introduced, in the course of ages, still further changes in the poem;—when, we say, all these facts are duly weighed, we shall feel that our preconceived ideas that a certain poet called *Homer* composed a certain long poem, still assumed to exist in its integrity, called the Iliad, about eight centuries before the Christian era, are liable to receive a rude shock, because probability and testimony are here directly at issue. Besides this, testimony (which at best is a mere traditional information, derived from a time when nothing like literary proprietorship existed, but all poetry was a common stock and possession) will not stand its ground against the sure and philosophical investigations of linguistic peculiarities, such as can be easily shown to distinguish different portions of the Iliad. The general authorship would easily be attributed to a Homer, if he was the first to combine and popularise the ballad-poetry of his time. Professor Köchly, treading in the steps of Wolf and Lachmann, has gone further than either, and claims to have unravelled from the Iliad sixteen distinct rhapsodies or poems, which he has edited as such under distinct titles, and has made uniform to a considerable extent, by taking detached portions of them from various books. Of course this is a theory which cannot have more than a certain internal probability, and that not perhaps a very high one, on its side. If it tends to establish the general fact that the Iliad is really only a collection and compilation of certain ancient ballads on certain heroes who took a part in an ancient military expedition, or even if it tends at all to make ordinary minds calmly weigh the arguments in favour of the theory, a good service will have been rendered to the study of ancient literature.

This work comes the more appropriately before us at the present time, and in this country, because Homeric studies have received of

late years a remarkable impulse. Partly from Mr. Gladstone's well-known work, partly from Colonel Mure's dissertations, partly from the many new translations into English, whether in so-called hexameter or in ballad metres, or (like Mr. Wright's) in the Miltonian blank verse,—our classical students are likely now to be more than ordinarily interested in what may fairly be called the Homeric controversy. We regret that our space does not allow us to go into critical questions and verbal details; we must therefore content ourselves generally with giving an idea of Professor Köchly's method in his new arrangement of the Homeric text.

In his preface, he boldly grapples with what he calls the "superstition about the poetical unity of the Iliad;" and he commences by this uncompromising assertion, that "no one now holds,—even of those who believe in the actual unity (*i. e.* of character and circumstance) of the Iliad,—that Homer was the sole *author* of the several poems commonly ascribed to him, in the sense in which we call other poetical composers of other times and nations the *authors* of their respective works." Indeed, the very naming of the several books by the Alexandrine critics, and the commonly received tradition that at least part of the second and the whole of the tenth book were later additions, are so far arguments for the theory of a distinct series of separable ballads.

If, he rightly remarks, Homer was not the author of the Iliad, he was only a clever patcher together of existing songs; one who had a sense for unity, and who probably sacrificed a good deal that was genuine in the older ballads which he strung together, to secure this very unity, real or apparent. He was not a poet in the sense of a creator or maker, ποιητής, of verses; he was ραψωδός, *i. e.* 'a stitcher-together of ballads.' This, Köchly adds, would be conceded at once, were it not that men are generally very unwilling to give up preconceived theories and pious traditions; rather than do which, they will seek to reconcile inconsistencies, and labour to defend what calm reason cannot justify. Others, willing enough to concede the theory of separate poems in the Iliad, are deterred from specifying or distinguishing them severally by the apparent hopelessness of the task, since broken fragments, short episodes, and mutilated or interpolated ends or beginnings of such poems, are all that can now be detected with any thing like clearness.

In attaining the desired object of exhibiting the separate ballads in as complete a form as is now possible, Köchly has taken some liberties with the actual text, and principally in the omission, the lopping and clearing away, of interpolatory matter. No impartial reader of Homer can fail to be struck with the frequency and the clumsiness of interpolated verses in our present text. They are so obvious in most cases, that one only feels surprised they have so long retained their places. Bekker, indeed, has ejected many, which he prints at the bottom of each page; but we believe these are too timidly and sparingly selected for condemnation. The whole result of Köchly's scheme is, that he has not given us any thing like the entire Iliad (as



ordinarily published), but only those parts of it out of which tolerably continuous and complete detached poems could be formed. And we must say he has done this with a very considerable ingenuity. The student of Homer may take any one of these and read it as a whole. He will at all events, *pro tanto*, be dealing with the Homeric text, even if out of the common order, and to the omission of some supplementary parts.

As the more recondite reasons for the separation of the Iliad into distinct poems are reserved for future discussion by our author (in part, at least), we will only here add a brief sketch of his scheme.

The first ballad (or *ῥαψωδία*) is called by its ancient title, the *Μῆνις*, or "Anger (of Achilles)." This comprises the former part or book i. down to v. 348, after which v. 488 is tacked on thus,

αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς  
[ἐκ τοῦ] μῆνι νηυσὶ παρήμενος ὠκυπόροισιν,

and the three lines, 490-3, conclude the subject, not inappropriately, it will be admitted. The second rhapsody is called *Λιταί*, "The Prayers;" viz. the petition of Achilles to his mother Thetis; and this is composed of book i. v. 349, to the end. The third poem is entitled *Ὀνειρος*, "The Dream," viz. the vision sent by Zeus to Agamemnon to urge him to action, book ii. 1 to 483, but with many omissions and rearrangements. The fourth poem is called *Ἀγορά*, "The Council," and is also made up from other parts of book ii., with the omission, of course, of the "Catalogue," which forms separately *ῥαψωδία* no. 5, entitled *Βοιώτῖα ἥτοι Κατάλογος νεῶν*. The sixth is *Ὀρκία*, or "The Sworn Treaty," or "The Duel of Paris and Menelaus," from books iii. and iv. This poem is extended to 531 lines. The seventh is *Τειχοσκοπία*; and Köchly adds to it *ἐπιπώλησις*, "The Visiting," a term the grammarians gave to the latter part of book iv. The *Τειχοσκοπία*, or "Helen's Survey of the Warriors from the Wall," is made up from book iii. v. 121 to 244. Ballad viii. is called *Διομήδους Ἀριστεΐα*, "The Achievements of Diomedes," from books iv. and v. This poem contains 693 lines. The ninth poem is *Ἑκτορος καὶ Ἀνδρομάχης ὁμιλία*, "The Meeting of Hector and Andromache," being the well-known and touching scene from II. vi. The tenth is entitled *Πρεσβεία*, "The Embassy," from books viii. and ix., containing the account of the mission of the Argive warriors to pacify Achilles. The eleventh, *Ἀγαμέμνονος ἀριστεΐα*, or *Κόλος μάχη* ("The Intercepted Fight"), is out of book xi., with some few parts inserted from other books. This describes the valorous deeds of Agamemnon, and the attack of the Trojans on the Argive camp and fleet. The twelfth poem is the *Τειχομαχία*, book xii., a continuation of the same subject. The thirteenth is entitled *Διὸς ἀπάτη*, and is a long poem of 900 lines, from several books, chiefly xiii. xiv. and xv. The title alludes to the deception practised on Zeus by putting him to sleep, that the Argives might gain an advantage over the Trojans, who were protected by Zeus. From the same three books is composed the fourteenth poem, called *ἡ ἐπὶ ναυσὶ μάχη*, "The Fight by the Ships." The remaining

two are respectively Πατρόκλεια, "The Story of Patroclus," and his affection for Achilles (books xvi. xvii. and part of xviii.), and "Ἔκτορος λύτρα, "The Ransom of Hector's Body" by Priam, which is from the xxivth book. It will be seen that the famous "shield of Achilles," in the xviiiith book, is omitted, as are also book x., the Dolonea, and books xix. to xxiii. inclusive. These latter form an *Achilleis*, or general account of the exploits of Achilles after he returned to the war, and at the funeral of Patroclus. They differ in important respects from the general style of the Iliad, but they must be very ancient; for it may be remarked that, in the minute accounts of the tombs and tumuli erected both for Patroclus and Hector, we have nearly every particular described which modern research has verified by an examination of the most ancient existing *tumuli* in Europe and Asia. Even a suggestion recently brought before the public, that the so-called Druidical circles are only the foundations of tumuli with the earth removed, receives a full and perfect confirmation from Il. xxiii. 255,

τορνῶσαντο δὲ σῆμα, θεμειλία τε προβάλοντο  
ἀμφὶ πυρὴν, εἶθαρ δὲ χυτὴν ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἔχεναν.

"They made a circular tomb, and laid first the foundation-stones round the place of the pyre, and forthwith heaped loose earth on it." Hence we understand why the most ancient tumuli generally contain burnt bones.

4. "The object of these pages," says Mr. Davies, in commencing his preface to the Choëphoræ, "is to contribute something towards a better knowledge of the works of Æschylus;" a laudable ambition, without doubt, but still an ambition, and one that should have good grounds to stand upon, considering the small proportion of real result to labour expended already, by so many eminent scholars and critics, on this short though most difficult remnant of ancient Greek literature.

Mr. Davies has not given us many new readings of the text, though he has suggested some new interpretations. On the whole, we think he has almost erred on the conservative side; for he has retained generally the standard readings, derived from the single Medicean Ms., and in many cases he appears to accept, almost without suspicion, passages which the majority of critics have long ago pronounced to be in some way corrupt, though they have not yet agreed how to correct them. The result of this procedure, speaking generally, is to lower our notions of ancient poetry, because it professes to explain, as genuine, words which at best will give only a poor and a forced sense. Mr. Davies's notes have the merit of being brief; but then it is obviously impossible to discuss sufficiently in two or three lines either the readings or the various senses adopted in or attributed to the more difficult passages. It is more easy simply to say that this means so-and-so than to make the reader believe it, without appending in full the reasons for such a decision *ex cathedra*.



Mr. Davies is evidently an original thinker: in many passages he has shown much sagacity as an interpreter, and he is by no means a mere book-maker of the ordinary stamp, nor a mere copyist of others' opinions. He knows his author well; and he exhibits in his commentary an extent of reading which gives him an undoubted claim to high scholarship. The Scholia from the Medicean Ms. are appended at the end of the text. These are very useful and valuable, and he has edited them carefully; but they are in many places very difficult, and still require elucidation, principally because they seem to be a medley of various ancient commentators, whose several notes and expositions, often on the same passage, require to be carefully disentangled. In a few instances Mr. Davies has very happily restored a corrupt reading in these Scholia; e.g. ἐπιπλέοντες for ἐπιπλέον in v. 506, κινουμένη for κινουμένη in 693, ζῶμεν for ὤμεν in 504, τιμωμένοις for τιμώμενος in 484. But the chief merit of the book consists in the excellent preface, in which Mr. Davies not only gives a much fuller and more accurate account of the stage arrangements, and the position of Agamemnon's tomb with respect to the actors and to the royal palace, than his predecessors had done, but he shows that the commentators had been deceived in supposing the chorus to consist of Trojan captives; and he clearly establishes the fact (which is of greater archæological than critical importance) that the poet intended them to represent *Greek* captive women who had been taken by Agamemnon, "King of Men," in his wars on some of the states bordering on Argos.

We must, however, observe, that we think Mr. Davies attaches too much weight to the theory that Æschylus borrowed largely from the *Odyssey* in composing this play. The subjects of the Greek plays generally were taken from the now-lost Cyclic poets, and not from Homer directly. Without doubt the whole subject of the Æschylean trilogy known as the *Orestea* was derived from the *Νόστοι* of Agias, or one of the kindred epics,—themselves an expansion of the brief notices of the Argive heroes contained in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

Some of Mr. Davies's innovations in the text we can hardly approve. Thus μένει χρονίζοντ', ἦν τύχη, v. 64, does not seem a usage of the Æschylean age, and is not nearly so good as Professor Newman's μένει χρονίζοντας ἄχη, which, in fact, is as nearly as possible the Ms. reading. Again, in v. 394, we fear κεί ποτ' ἂν ἀμφιθαλὲς Ζεὺς ἐπὶ χεῖρα βάλοι can hardly be defended even as good Greek. In v. 224, the reading ἐγὼ σε προὐννέπω is wrong, because ἐγὼ is never used unless there is emphasis on the person speaking. A better correction, though by no means carrying conviction with it, is ἴαμ' ἀνιέρων αἵματηρόν, in v. 474. Hermann's emendation of that obscure and corrupt passage, διώκειν ἔριν αἵματηράν, is defended by ἦν ἥρισε of the scholiast, which we think Mr. Davies infelicitously alters into ἦν ἥρισε. He should have corrected the scholium thus, ἦν ἥρισε πρὸς τὴν μητέρα, instead of πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

5. Peerlkamp's Horace is an improved edition of one that appeared about thirty years ago. From the novelty of the criticism and the grave doubts it threw on the genuineness of many favourite Horatian verses, it was then met (as the author himself says) with a perfect storm of hostile pamphlets. It is now reprinted in an extremely elegant form, and though it only contains the Odes, Epodes, and Carmen Sæculare, it forms a large octavo, very copiously annotated, of above 400 pages.

We will not stop to notice in detail, though we mention it with pleasure, the remarkable purity and elegance of Peerlkamp's Latinity. We introduce him to the reader simply as an enthusiastic admirer of our Bentley, whom, however, he is not afraid to out-Bentleyise, if one may use so strange an expression, in his attacks upon received readings. He says himself of his own more juvenile efforts in Horatian criticism, that when he first saw Bentley's Horace, and found he had been anticipated by him in so many points, he flung aside his own notes in a kind of peevish despair. "*Lectis autem Bentleii commentariis, omnis plane labor meus, quem jam aliquot annos Horatio impenderam, frustra fuit. Nonnulla enim, quæ superiorum diligentiam effugerant, ego autem me primum invenisse arbitrabar, non effugerant acutissime cernentem Britannum, cujus ego sagacitatem et doctrinam repetita lectione ita admiratus sum, ut in magno pudore et desperatione Horatium et omnia Horatiana mea abjicerem.*" The question how much value attaches to criticism of this kind, in which two scholars independently agree, cannot easily be determined by the law of chances; but it must ever constitute a high degree of probability that they are right.

Our author, however, begins with a theory, and shares, perhaps in common with most men, the danger of going very far in forcing facts to suit it. He says that on reading Horace, nay, studying him, lecturing on him, and making himself as familiar as possible with his writings, he still found difficulties in explaining many parts of the odes. Was the fault, he asks, a natural obscurity of the writer? But the best Roman poets did not fail in this respect to their contemporaries. Was it ignorance in the reader? But the study of half a life precludes this supposition. Was it the fault of his interpreters? The most learned men, in hundreds, had devoted themselves to the task. Were the Mss. corrupt? But they presented only trifling differences. If none of these were the causes, then,—he jumps to the conclusion,—Horace's odes must have been extensively interpolated. This, then, is the key to the present edition. The supposed spurious passages (which are extensive and extremely numerous) are printed throughout the text in *Italic characters*.

Peerlkamp assures us, however, that he did not rush into print with his *expurgated Horace*, but he kept it by him a long time, both to reconsider his own views and discuss them with other scholars. He gives us in his preface many sound and sensible reasons for believing that the works of Horace, which were left uncollected, and not even finally finished, at the rather sudden and premature death of



their author, would be largely tampered with in the first century or two after Christ. The works of Horace and Virgil were, we know, actually taught to the boys in public schools as early as the end of the first century.<sup>1</sup>

Among other probable sources of interpolation, Peerlkamp enumerates the lyric poems of authors either contemporary with, or a little later than, Horace, and probably themselves more or less his imitators, —such as Antonius Rufus, Titus Septimius, Passienus Paulus, Cæsius Bassus. “*Suspisor nonnulla horum Lyricorum carmina, quæ in tabernis jacerent intacta, hic illic Horatianis accessisse, eaque additamenta in optimis habenda, qualis est oratio Europæ (Od. iii. 27, 37 seqq.)*.”<sup>2</sup> He cites the authority of the younger Pliny (Ep. ix. 22) to prove that Passienus Paulus was “a second Horace” in lyrical compositions, and he shows several causes why a confusion between the genuine and the interpolated might easily have occurred in the early ages. In some instances, he thinks, professed imitations of the lyric style of Horace, for which prizes were offered, have become incorporated with the genuine odes. The many fires which occurred during the reign of the post-Augustan emperors, and which destroyed temples, houses, and libraries, public and private, would, he contends, soon have obliterated, especially when added to civil wars and seditions, the authentic copies of the most celebrated Roman writers, and left only fragmentary and interpolated ones.

All this, of course, is but conjecture. The remarks apply equally to every work of antiquity, not excluding the Scriptures themselves. We do not see that the argument can ever be carried beyond the limits of a kind of plausibility; for, on the other hand, there is the remarkable uniformity of every known Ms. in support of our Vulgate texts. And that cannot be lightly set aside; for if the process of extensive corruption and interpolation set in so early, why should it have wholly ceased during the last thousand years and more, to which our existing Mss. extend, and in which no material differences occur?

If Peerlkamp's theory be true, or even approximately true, we must resign at once somewhere about a fourth or a fifth of the matter which has hitherto passed for Horatian. What then? It is at least matter nearly as ancient, so nearly equal in merit as to have raised no suspicion of its genuineness for eighteen centuries, and now so incorporated with our ideas of Roman life, and history, and mythology, that we shall never cease to view it as a part of one great and venerable whole. We regard such investigations as eminently useful in their way, because they are exercises of the very highest and acutest critical faculty. Those who will not even listen to reason (and their number is legion) are of course bound to go on in their conviction that Horace is Horace. We confess that we leave Peerlkamp's book

<sup>1</sup> Juv. Sat. vii. 226:

“*Quot stabant pueri, totus cum decolor esset  
Flaccus, et hæeret nigro fuligo Maroni.*”

<sup>2</sup> Preface, p. xii.

with respect, and conceive that there is a great deal of matter both in his preface and his commentary which is worthy of the best attention of the best scholars.

6. Dr. Beckmann has undertaken to answer several questions which are naturally suggested by the persecution of Galileo, and on which contradictory statements are often made. Was the Copernican system tolerated by the Holy See for three-quarters of a century after its publication? Did it meet with more favour among Catholics or Protestants? Was it deemed originally a hypothesis or a certain discovery? Speculation and observation had begun in the thirteenth century to question the truth of the Ptolemaic astronomy, and the first intimation of the new discovery was received with enthusiasm, at least in Italy, where Copernicus lectured in the year 1500. The only opposition he is recorded to have met with in his life was at Elbing, and was caused, not by his scientific opinions, but by his zeal in defence of his order. Yet he was persuaded that his book would give offence, and was only induced to publish it when he found, by the solicitations of Cardinal Schönberg and the Bishop of Kulm, that he was safe with the ecclesiastical authorities at least. But the fears expressed in his famous dedication to the Pope were verified soon after his death. His friend Rheticus endeavoured in vain to silence the hostility of the professors at Wittenberg. Their colleague Osiander added an anonymous preface, in which he described the new system as a mere hypothesis, which only claimed to be convenient, not to be true. Six years later Melanchthon publicly condemned it as contrary to Scripture, to reason, and to the reverence due to the established opinion—"adseverare palam absurdas sententias non est honestum et nocet exemplo." In obedience to this feeling of alarm, Tycho de Brahe devised a new geocentric system, and Kepler, after being censured by the divines of Tübingen for disturbing the peace of the Church, was compelled to seek a refuge in Austria. During the whole of the sixteenth century the views of Copernicus were not attacked by any Catholic divine, and the opposition came exclusively from the Protestants. But it was not to them only that the warning of Cardinal Hosius applied:—"Evangelium non in verbis Scripturarum, sed in sensu, non in superficie, sed in medulla, non in sermonum est foliis, sed in radice rationis." In the year 1616 the Congregation of the Index condemned the Copernican hypothesis, and the decree was not rescinded till 1757; and the first edition of the Index in which the heliocentric writings are omitted is that published in 1835. If the opinion of our author may be followed, the Protestants caused the Copernican system to be suspected at Rome, and the decree of the Index led to its acceptance among the Protestants. One of the professors of Tübingen in the time of Galileo declared, that nothing could have convinced him of the truth of the system but its condemnation by the Pope, who was Antichrist. On the other hand, Osiander's preface was supposed to be written by Copernicus himself; and it was therefore imagined that he regarded his system only as a hypothesis,



and Dr. Beckmann believes that if the preface had not appeared, Galileo would not have been molested. Certain it is that the Bishop of Kulm did all he could to obtain of the senate of Nuremberg the omission of Osiander's preface.

7. These four books have thus much in common, that they are all woven out of original documents and founded on original research, and all relate to what may be loosely considered one period of history. M. Teulet has collected all the diplomatic documents relating to the history of Mary Stuart which he could find in the repositories of France. His book is necessary for the student of that period, and furnishes evidence to clear up many points left uncertain by Labanoff. The work of the editor is confined to two excellent prefaces, and a very careful summary prefixed to each document. The summaries of the Spanish papers are full enough to dispense with a knowledge of the Spanish language in the student.

8. Mr. Spedding is as excellent an editor as M. Teulet. He had already given us the best edition of Lord Bacon's philosophical, literary, and professional works; and his two present volumes contain Bacon's letters and occasional writings, down to the death of Essex, connected together by a biographical and historical commentary which, except on one subject, leaves little to be desired. The excepted subject is religion; about which he is both prejudiced and ignorant, and quite incapable even of that degree of fairness which Bacon exhibited in the midst of the strife. In this respect he takes a partisan's view of the times, and is earnest in trying to identify Bacon's religious views with his own, and to prove him to be a conscientious Puritan, instead of a *politique*, as he confesses himself to be (vol. i. p. 91). He accepts without inquiry all Bacon's charges against Catholics, however inconsistent with each other; but things which tell against Puritans he generally acquits Bacon of having written, alleging them to be Whitgift's. He has not a word of rebuke for Bacon's misrepresentation of the severity of the penal laws, nor for his halting history, which makes the rebellion of the North a consequence of the (subsequent) publication of the Bull *Regnans in excelsis*. He will not believe the Catholics upon oath (vol. ii. p. 119), though Bacon, speaking privately to the Queen, owns the absurdity of the doubt (vol. i. p. 49): "that they make conscience of an oath," he says, "the troubles, losses, and disgraces that they suffer for refusing the same do sufficiently testify." When Bacon addressed Protestants, he was not shy to confess the discredit and weakness caused by their heart-burnings and dissensions (vol. i. p. 50), though when he had to answer Cardinal Allen he angrily denied that these divisions were of the least consequence (p. 165). This and the like inconsistencies might have suggested to his editor that Bacon was not quite a fair authority on such points. But Mr. Spedding only gilds the refined gold of Bacon's misrepresentations, which it would be impossible for him to do if more interest were felt in England for the

truth of ecclesiastical history. Prejudice still believes the stupid and fraudulent blunders of contemporary passion; and there is very little desire that they should be corrected. In other respects, Mr. Spedding's volumes are excellent, though we by no means accept his apology for Bacon's treachery to Essex. He may have proved extenuating circumstances, but he has only, as it were, reduced the crime from murder to manslaughter.

9. Mr. Bourne writes with the same religious prejudice but with inferior literary power, and less knowledge of the times. He must be pardoned for knowing nothing of the passages between Sir Philip Sidney and Campion at Prague in 1577, for they were only to be learned from Catholic sources; and such materials of history are not often used by our English writers on Elizabeth and her times. Sidney described the English Catholics of his day as men of "great numbers, of great riches, and of united minds;" among whom were to be found those "of the bravest and wakefullest sort, and that knew the advantage of the world most." But they were conquered, and stowed away, and their own accounts of the passages of their times yet lie buried under the taunts of their assailants, or under the smooth and lying commonplaces of the victorious party, which had to write the story of the contest. Mr. Bourne is more ignorant and careless on this branch of the subject than most writers of his kind. He tells us that the "Northern Rebellion" was headed by the Duke of Norfolk, who was executed in 1572 (p. 255). He has the simplicity to suppose that the alliance which Sidney was sent to the Emperor Rudolph to propose in 1577 was a "Protestant league." He knows of the "politiques" no more than Mr. Spedding, and therefore never guessed that this league was to be one which should secure to both religions (Catholic and Protestant) full toleration and liberty of worship throughout Germany, England, Scotland, Holland, and Sweden. The preliminaries were settled at Spire in 1573; and a copy of the treaty has been for the first time published by M. Teulet in vol. v. of his collection. The design arose from the horror excited by the massacre of St. Bartholomew; it was doubtless well received by Maximilian, but was rejected by his son Rodolph, under Spanish influence.

10. M. Prat is probably better acquainted with the original sources of the religious history of the 16th century than almost any other writer of our days, and might render invaluable service to the historian if he were to publish merely an index to the papers he has consulted and analysed, and a slight summary of them. The worst of his present book is, that it is impossible to know where the historical documents end, and where M. Prat begins. He has written in behalf of an interest, or rather two interests, for the sake of which he does not hesitate to suppress any statement which a historian who had no such purpose, and was writing only for the sake of truth, would deem it a sacred obligation not to conceal. It is hardly necessary to read beyond



the sixth page in order to see this. Nothing can be more notorious than that Cardinal Alexander Farnese was grandson of Paul III., yet the author persists in calling one the uncle, the other the nephew. M. Prat himself furnishes the rule by which publications of this kind should be judged. At pp. 200, 201, he talks of an outrage committed on the memory of St. Charles Borromeo. This outrage was the publication in 1762-3 of some letters of St. Charles, in which he shows a distrust, or only a discriminating approbation, of the Society of Jesus; and M. Prat argues that because the publishers of these letters were notorious enemies of the Jesuits, therefore "the letters have not come down to us entire, and the sincerity of their publication is as suspicious as the impartiality of the publishers." "This is enough," he says, "to destroy the authority of the publication." His own work judged by the rule, that the *animus* destroyed the authority, would receive the same sentence. In pp. 405-444 we have an account of the relations of Sixtus V. with the Jesuits. The Pope, who held the very views which are attributed to St. Charles in the letters we have mentioned, is not directly blamed; but Father Vasquez, who supported the Pope's views within the Society, is said at his death to have left "a terrible lesson to such monks as cannot sacrifice to the spirit of their rule a few dislikes or certain crossnesses of character" (p. 413). In M. Prat's scale of interest the Company of Jesus is supposed to be the highest expression of the Church, and consequently enthusiastic loyalty to the Company is made the test of the highest kind of Christianity. Thus in a previous passage, pp. 347-357, he makes, in the same way, the interests of the Church override the dictates of truth, honesty, and common sense, in his singular exposition and defence of the relations between the Church (and especially the Society of Jesus) and the Spanish Inquisition. The history is very curious, only it is a pity that we have not the documents before us in a book that would not make us suspect "the sincerity of their publication." Hefeles, and the other "honest writers" who have abandoned the defence of the Inquisition, are derided, and M. Prat, with all the ardour of a mere antiquary, sets himself to lament the disappearance of a state of society which could not only tolerate such an institution, but could regard it as the great palladium,—if not of liberty, at least of morality and well-being.

Ribadeneyra, the most tiresome historian of the sixteenth century, was not quite so considerable a man as M. Prat endeavours to prove him. But his representations to Philip II., after the catastrophe of the Armada in 1588 (p. 365), show him in a very respectable light, though they at the same time demonstrate how entirely blind he was to the great ethical laws of cause and effect in politics.

11. The class of editors to whom the Bishop of Bath and Wells belongs reminds one a good deal of those modern travellers of whom Captain Burton is the type. They have an eye only to the business immediately before them. Their one work is to draw out the man whom they describe, such as he hoped that he was, not such

as he really proved himself to be. Thus they become at once the most unfair and the most innocent of advocates, enthusiastic discoverers of mares' nests, "sober dreamers, grave and wise, and pregnant with discoveries new and rare," narrating "feats of heroes little known," describing "the man of whom his own coevals took but little note" as the most notable of his age, full of wise thoughts, and charged "with meanings that he never had, or having, kept concealed."

In the two present volumes, which contain correspondence stretching from March 1793 to April 1814, we are totally unable to discover any reason to change the verdict of history on Lord Auckland's conduct with regard to Mr. Pitt in February 1801, when the great minister resigned because he was not allowed to carry the measure of Emancipation, on the faith of which he had accomplished the union of England and Ireland. Lord Auckland's honest bigotry may explain his personal conduct, but cannot restore his reputation for statesmanship. His reasoning might have passed muster in 1575; but what shall we say to a man who in 1801 could thus argue against the abolition of the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland? "Is such an enterprise necessary? Is it expedient? . . . Will it convert disaffection to loyalty? Will it change antipathies and intolerance into mutual love and indulgence? Will it reconcile sects which a long and bloody experience has shown to be irreconcilable? Will it stand clear of the imputation (however unjust) of unconcern and apathy respecting truths the most essential both to present and future life? Will it not be considered as tending to revolution, either through the influence of irreligion by the equipoise, or rather the confusion, of all creeds and worship, as so many state juggles, or through the effect of a religious alarm and animosity, which may possibly burst forth in every part of the empire?" This may perhaps be convincing in the eyes of an editor who is glad to think that Pitt considered Burke's writings "rhapsodies," and who agrees with Lord Clare in thinking the same great statesman a Popish agitator and revolutionist; but it is enough to show that Lord Auckland had not learned the first principles of politics.

With regard to his personal behaviour on the matter, he never convinced Pitt that he had acted properly. "Widely as we differ," said Pitt, "on the subject itself which led to it, I am afraid we should differ at least as much as to the question on which side there had been a failure of friendship, confidence, or attention, in reference to this business. I feel this so strongly, that I will not dwell upon it."

Lord Auckland was a diplomatist without any science of politics; his ballast was a certain cleverness in negotiation, and a general patriotism. For principles he had only prejudices. And though he was usually carried away by the overwhelming torrent of Pitt's vigorous genius, yet, when he did withstand it, his opposition was usually misplaced, and fraught with inconvenience and calamity to subsequent times. Like most people, he was beloved by his own family; and he so far won the admiration of his friends as to make one of them assure him in a private letter, that he had made a more



meritorious use of an enlightened understanding and strong abilities than any one else, native or foreign, of the period, and that he was the ideal model upon which all other men ought to have been formed.

12. The anonymous memoir of the late Duke of Richmond might have been written by the court newsman, without much more information than could be gathered from Hansard, the Sussex newspapers, and the Despatches of the Duke of Wellington. The writer does not seem to have used any unpublished document or any private letters, though he has had the advantage of being told some few jokes which the subject of his memoir is said to have laughed at at his own breakfast-table. It is clearly unfair to judge any man from such a biography as this. So far as the curtain is lifted, we see an English gentleman, brave, honourable, sporting, bigoted, superior to the average bucolic mind of his day in his acceptance of the necessity of reform, though fully on its level in his subsequent championship of protection; and here and there, perhaps, the reader may catch a glimpse of features out of which an able hand might have composed a not uninteresting portraiture. The Duke of Richmond was a gallant soldier, on the staff of the Duke of Wellington in the Peninsula, and always honoured by his chief; but this book would make us almost think that he must have been in the Duke's mind when he said, "I begin to be of opinion that there is nothing on earth so stupid as a gallant officer" (*Supplementary Despatches*, vii. 123).

13. Is it best to keep or to destroy correspondence? Those who keep it are encumbered with a daily-increasing mass of materials requiring house-room, and days of labour to put in order if it once gets disarranged, not to mention a secret impression that it is principally waste paper, and some pangs when certain portions of those yellow scrolls and faded characters meet the eye. On the other hand, those who keep their letters may at least be certain that, like wines stored up in the cellar, the value of the documents is increasing with each year they are kept. A note which to-day is worthless has become of some interest when it is twenty years older, and rapidly assumes a historical value when it can recall remoter periods. But we suppose it is not often a man has the courage, like Mr. Trench, to publish a selection from his own schoolboy and college letters. His father, it appears, had preserved the entire series of the son's letters from Harrow and Oxford, with some of the replies from home, and Mr. Trench has had a small volume of them printed, and promises a continuation. The collection is curious enough to deserve publication, although, in one or two places, the early letters show that amusing poverty of thought, combined with manliness of manner, which so often characterises the time of growing youth. The latter portion belongs more peculiarly to the education of a place like Harrow, from which the writer appears to have come up to Oxford, well prepared to profit by the university system as it then was. But his position was such that

whilst it gave him access to the best society of the place, it did not render compulsory that severe application without which the highest honours are not attainable. Hence he gained a respectable rank in the schools, though not what he styles the "blue ribbon" of academic success. However, we have here, as far as they go, the reflections of a competent observer, considering his years, and we should have had no objection had they been more copious.

The personal reminiscences are occasionally of interest. For example, he writes in 1828:

"Of all the tutors here [at Oriel College], perhaps there is no one who takes more interest in the success of the men than one of the juniors. I mean Newman, who is a clever and hardworking man, and, it is said, would himself have taken a first-class, had it not been that his health failed about the intended time of examination" (p. 134).

The editor adds the following curious note:

"His celebrity at that time had not begun. He was then the *ἀναλκις λέων* (as Coplestone, I believe, termed him), whose powers subsequently, but not long after, were developed with such fatal results."

In those days Oriel was a rising college, and admission into it is described as more difficult than into any other of the colleges in Oxford. The education of the place was then pretty much what it remained until the great academical revolution of 1851. Aristotle's Ethics coloured the whole, and the classics formed the great staple of studies, though they were cultivated less in a philological sense than as a means of at once strengthening and refining the mind by the exact knowledge of their subject-matter. Perhaps the refinement predominated. Under this system there can be no doubt that very essential branches of a complete education were much neglected. In proof of this, the following sentence from a letter of this Oxford student,—a good specimen, as he was, of an accomplished English youth of those days,—will suffice. In 1826, when near his degrees, he writes:

"I wish that I shared in F.'s knowledge of French. It seems to have given him quite a new source of literary interest. It is no trifle to have the learning of that difficult language before one. At present I can read it but little, and cannot speak one single sentence correctly" (p. 103).

The charge of formality has always applied to Oxford. Mr. Trench, in 1824, writes, that "many people say that the formality of Oxford is marked and disagreeable," but defends it on the ground that it prevents violence and quarrelling. "A duel is never thought of." The correspondence itself affords sufficient evidence of this characteristic. There is a certain air of distance and reserved politeness in the writer's communications with his father, which, whilst far less restrained than the type of the *Spectator*, have still a certain trace of



the manner of those distant times. Near as we still are to 1824, the revolution effected in social arrangements has been so great in the time, that the rising generation perhaps bear less resemblance to those of that date than the latter did to their ancestors of a hundred years preceding. Were there no other causes for the change, the increased means of locomotion would of itself make a great difference in various ways. The following is an interesting example of the far greater isolation in which the inhabitants of different parts of England then lived. Mr. Trench writes to his father in 1825:

"I have had an invitation from my friend Ralph Carr to visit him in Durham. Would there be any objection to my accepting? I should like to see a little of north-country life, which is quite unknown to me; and he says that a southerner is sure to be made much of as a *rara avis* in those parts" (p. 70).

The influence of the Union Debating Society in giving a political and vigorous turn of mind to the Oxford students comes out in these letters, as might be expected. In future histories of England, institutions which have so largely shared in forming men like Mr. Gladstone and Sir Roundell Palmer will deserve an ample consideration. Mr. Trench's family holding property in Ireland, many particulars of interest occur in the latter part of the correspondence relative to the affairs of that country, presenting a forlorn picture of disorder and misery. Much that he tells us of the failure of the potato crop in 1831 (which seems to have been a kind of anticipation of the famine of 1845-47) would describe a state of things even now imminent. The aspect of London about the same period, during the Reform agitation, is also described in such a manner as to afford the historical student a few hints of some value towards obtaining a distinct idea of the times. And there are interesting passages relating to Lord Cochrane, Peel, and Lady Noel Byron, all of whom Mr. Trench had met in society, and of whom he gives particulars for which it is but fair to refer our readers to the volume itself.

14. Mr. St. John's *Life in the Forests of the Far East* treats Borneo in a method similar, in some respects, to that of Sir Emerson Tennent's exhaustive account of Ceylon. The difference of the result springs rather from the country and races described than from the describers. Ceylon is an old country, with an ancient civilisation, a history, archives, and the traditions of European government and missionary influence for many generations. Borneo is a much larger island, most of which is still unknown, peopled by wild tribes without a history, and, like all barbarians, shy of explaining their traditions to the white man. But Mr. St. John's official position in Borneo gave him advantages like those of Sir E. Tennent in Ceylon, and both men have used every available help from friends and acquaintances in compiling their volumes. With all his advantages however, Mr. St. John has only made himself acquainted with one side of the island, (the north), and about this he gives us more information than any

previous traveller. His description of the tribes, whom he groups together with a certain happiness of generalisation, is valuable to the ethnologist, while his various expeditions along the coast and into the interior supply much new information to the geographer and the naturalist.

15. The concentrated form in which they appear gives some value to the eleven chapters, by different hands, and on different countries, which compose *Vacation Tourists*. Each writer appears to have travelled, not to grumble, but to enjoy; not to compare one land with another, but to describe what is to be seen in the one he happens to be in. He identifies himself for the moment with the people he is visiting, strives to see every thing from their point of view, and thus puts them forward as the most important and interesting people in the world. He becomes the advocate and partisan of his temporary acquaintances, thus making himself a mere collector of materials, and leaving altogether to his readers the task of comparing and judging. The most interesting chapter in the book is that on Montenegro, signed J. M.; the least so, from its detestable style, is that on the Fiji Islands.

16. To write really good dialogues on philosophical subjects is perhaps one of the rarest achievements of genius; to effect which it is certainly not enough to label a series of thoughts with the imaginary names of persons. Even the most consummate examples we possess in this department are not absolutely perfect. In Plato's dialogues, whilst Socrates, Thrasymachus, Gorgias, are full of the characteristic, whole pages occur in which the chief speaker alone is represented with dramatic colouring, and the rest speak in monosyllables. Cicero's scene-painting is beautiful, and he preserves a well-marked intellectual individuality for his speakers; for example, in the *De Oratore*. Berkeley has imitated Plato very successfully; for instance, in the character of Alciphron. But these precedents should make writers cautious of attempting the style who are as deficient in dramatic imagination as Sir Benjamin Brodie appears to be, judging from the Second Part of his *Psychological Inquiries*. We would willingly dispense with Eubulus, Crites, and Ergates, and hear what the author has got to say *in propria personâ*. The subjects he examines are of the most important kind,—such as the proper method of scientific investigation; the dependence of the mind on the due order of the animal functions; the theories of human happiness, and of systems of education; the general laws of the universe, and the question of their permanence; the future destiny of mankind. A man of scientific eminence must always have something to say on such subjects that will be worth hearing, and Sir Benjamin Brodie has rightly wished to bring different provinces of knowledge to act upon each other,—in particular, to place moral and physical philosophy in connection. But we cannot say that he deals with more than the surface of these great questions; and the form of dialogue has



rendered the general effect of his book rather watery. The physical law to which his great experience seems to lead him to give most prominence is, that the nervous force is consumed equally in mental as in bodily exertion; and if overmuch of it be expended in one way, there must be proportionately less to be expended in another (p. 89); and again, that the depressing passions especially—anger, fear, anxiety—use up the nervous force, and interfere with the exercise of the intellect. Bacon's excellent remark as to the danger to the health from "anger *fretting inwards*" would here apply.

17. Sir Henry Holland's *Essays* are of the kind best suited for the object which they profess. They contain no original research, no elaborate inductions to prove new hypotheses; but they are reviews, made by a person of exact and varied information, of the progress and present position of the chief branches of modern science. Abstaining from all mere technicalities, the author writes for the general public; but there is nothing clap-trap in his style, and he writes like an educated gentleman addressing educated gentlemen. He is not one of the giants of science; his authority does not rank very high, nor are his conclusions in any sense infallible; but his fairness of mind, and the absence of those sceptical tendencies which characterised the great naturalists of the last century, and are still found in some of those of the present day, make his book as pleasant as it is instructive.

18. The Paulists are a branch from the Redemptorists, and they comprise, we believe, all the American Fathers of the order who were professed when the present General came into power and introduced a new policy. Their separation was perfectly in order, and took place with the sanction and approval of the authorities at Rome. Their superior, Father Hecker, the author of the first volume of *Sermons by the Paulists*, is a man of great ability, whose views on the relations of Christianity and politics are worth studying. In his practical teaching he lays down the cardinal virtues as the indispensable foundation of the theological virtues, the man as the basis of the Christian, and civilised society as the root of Christian society. Tocqueville would have found in him exactly what he missed in the French clergy—a union of the love of religion and morality with that of liberty and progress. Though there is no reference whatever in his sermons to the exciting topics of the day, he gives the political duties of the Christian a religious sanction, and preaches as vehemently against the vices of the "bribed judge, the corrupt legislator, the dishonest official, the swindling speculator in government contracts," as against those of the libertine, the drunkard, and the irreligious and indifferent man. He exhorts his audience to strive to be men. "Christianity finds us men and leaves us men; gentle, not cowardly; childlike, not childish; amiable, not effeminate; zealous, not fanatical; earnest, not narrow-minded; humble, not abject; full of faith, and yet rational; obedient, not slavish; mortified, not mu-

tilated. For Christ died to save man, not to transmute man into something else. Christianity demands for its fullest manifestation the most complete nature. The more we are men, the greater our capacity for Christianity."

He impresses on his hearers that the ordinary duties of life are the high roads to sanctity, and the only roads for the great mass of Christians, whose highest and noblest life is in the performance of their daily duties. His wish is to reconcile the idea of sanctity with the completeness of the natural man : to teach that faith does not ask for the depression or mutilation of our nature, or of its instincts; that religion truly understood gives completeness to character, and that the Church asks for men, not ciphers or cripples.

He accepts the life which his fellow-citizens live, and puts forward no new ideal ; he acquiesces in the notion that it is the duty of all citizens " to attend political meetings, and to approach the polls at election time." The only calling which he utterly condemns is that of the dram-shop keeper. We have no doubt that he thoroughly sympathises with the North against the Secessionists, and that he shares the feelings of his countrymen against England. The only ideal which he seems to cultivate in the sphere of politics is that of the hierarchy of ranks; and he comforts himself by remembering that if America lacks all other aristocracies, it has those of wealth and education. The necessary distinction of classes is deeply impressed on his mind, and he does not scruple to tell his democratic and equality-loving audience that " the offence of Judas was heightened by the lowness of his origin. . . . He was a poor young man, without family, rank, or other claim on the notice of our Lord." Could such a sentence be preached in an aristocratic country ?

---



## CURRENT EVENTS.

The revised  
Educational  
Code.

THE controversy on the Revised Code has issued in the adoption of two new principles in the administration of the educational grant. Henceforth (1) the relations of Government will be with the managers of schools only, not with the masters or pupil-teachers ; and (2) there will be an individual examination of scholars, the results of which will have a bearing on the appropriation of the public money. The effect of the change is at once to decentralise our educational system ; to make the local managers, in each case, the real masters of the school ; and to substitute individual agents, responsible to them and in their direct employment, for the body of public functionaries by whom the teaching has been hitherto carried on. The vested interests which were growing up under the former system are thus swept away ; while an endeavour to prevent the accumulation of fresh ones is made by founding the new arrangement, as far as possible, on the basis of payment for actual results.

The two new principles were the essence of the code ; and though Mr. Lowe only succeeded in saving them by the sacrifice of almost every important detail of his original scheme, his opponents were still less happy in being compelled to accept a superficial victory which fatally undermines their position. Mr. Walpole, indeed, had all along proclaimed himself in principle a supporter of the code ; so that on the 5th of May, when he accepted the concessions offered by the Government, he was fully justified in claiming a personal triumph. But it is one in which those who followed him have no share, and from which they can derive little intelligent satisfaction. An established system does not necessarily suffer because its assailants succeed in modifying its features ; but it stultifies itself, *ipso facto*, by the adoption of a principle which it cannot assimilate. Payment for certain results is perfectly intelligible as the basis of an educational scheme, and so is the provision of certain means by which it is assumed that those results will be obtained ; but the two principles cannot work simultaneously without obvious injustice, unless the provision of means is made equal in the case of all who are candidates for the payment, or the results which will entitle to the payment are allowed to vary according to the means provided. Adopt the first alternative, and the State must forthwith find schoolmasters for all possible scholars ; adopt the second, and it must adjust the relations between absolute and contingent payment with an arbitrary theoretical nicety which contains all the elements of practical disappointment and confusion.

The compromise which has been adopted may or may not last beyond the present year ; but, in either case, its chief permanent effect must be to give greater prominence to a series of questions which it makes no attempt to solve. Instantly on Mr. Walpole's

withdrawal of his resolution, the key-note of the future controversy was struck by Mr. Walter, who moved, "That to require the employment of certificated masters and pupil-teachers by managers of schools, as an indispensable condition of their participation in the parliamentary grant, is inexpedient, and inconsistent with the principle of payment for results which forms the basis of the Revised Code." The proposal was rejected by a majority of 7 in a House of 319; but it expresses a consequence which in the nature of things cannot be long evaded. While the State confined itself to the provision of an educational machinery, the perfection of its work was not directly dependent on the greater or less amount of raw material on which that machinery was brought to bear. But the case is altered now that it has turned its immediate attention to results. Its relations have become as direct with the scholar as they are with the schoolmaster; and it cannot continue to ignore either the schools which at present receive no government assistance, or the children who remain altogether untaught.

**Distress  
in  
Lancashire.**

Early in May the Government sent a Special Commissioner into Lancashire, to investigate the local operation of the poor laws, to inform the Boards of Guardians on the subject of their powers and duties, and to harmonise their action with that of the different relief committees which have been organised on the spot by voluntary effort. This measure has had a considerable effect in developing the powers of the actual legal machinery, as well as in stimulating private exertion and preventing the waste of funds; and even if the hopes which are entertained of a supply of cotton at no very distant date, if not from America at all events from other countries, should be disappointed, there is still no reason to conclude that Lancashire will eventually be unable to cope with its own difficulties. At present there is no doubt of its power to do so. The rateable value of the county is upwards of 7,000,000*l.*, while the expenditure on the poor is under 700,000*l.* a year; and the rate must stand at three times its present amount before it is the highest in England. The pressure on the general resources of the county, however, must not be taken as a sufficient test of the amount of individual suffering, because the distress is very unequal in its distribution,—passing over some districts altogether, and falling, of course, with all its weight on those particular towns which are devoted to the cotton manufacture. Here the misery is intense; and the manner in which it has been borne is a fair test both of the intellectual and moral development of the Lancashire operatives. They have been subsisting, at the best, on relief which the government Commissioner describes as insufficient to keep them in health till the return of work; but there has been no tendency among them to attribute the distress to imaginary causes, or to clamour for any delusive remedies. And if their attitude should remain the same under the heavier trial which is probably awaiting them, it will go a long way, in fact as



well as in reason, to cancel those political apprehensions which were raised in the public mind by the strike of the building trades in 1860.

This is a consequence which has already been recognised by the only statesman in England who, of late years, has ventured on a public and formal defence of the theory of rotten boroughs. In a speech at Manchester on the 24th of April, Mr. Gladstone appealed to "the moral and social signs which the darkness of this period has brought into view" against those by whom "we are told that the people cannot be trusted; that they are fit for nothing except to earn daily bread; that you must not call them to the exercise of higher functions, or look to them for enlightened views." And, acting on his own words, he took occasion at the same time to call attention to the amount of the public expenditure, and to urge upon his hearers that in a self governing country there can be little actual saving while the heart of the nation is set on spending.

The present Government claims to have reduced its estimates by three millions and a half in the course of two years,—not under the pressure of parliamentary necessity, but in the teeth both of Parliament and the country; and though a politician of less ardent temperament than Mr. Gladstone might have hesitated to choose Manchester in the agonies of a cotton famine as the scene of his effort, it is natural in itself that the finance minister of such a government should endeavour to strengthen its resistance to expenditure by the support of that power which is essentially the same, whether it is invoked as the force of public opinion or deprecated as pressure from without. "The great masses," as Mr. Stansfeld afterwards remarked, "move on great and simple lines, and so it is with great aggregates of public opinion;" and it belongs to the functions of a government both to employ and to moderate those forces by the discriminating application of which it shapes its policy into act. For the first twenty years after the passing of the Reform Bill, the country was bent on retrenchment; and the difficulty was for ministers to obtain money from the House of Commons. The Crimean war brought about a reaction; and since then Ministers have had to limit the generosity of Parliament rather than to stimulate it. The one-sided desire for economy at all hazards has been succeeded by an equally one-sided desire for efficiency at any price. In both cases the motion is instinctive rather than rational; and it finds its ultimate expression in an *ἦθος* rather than a theory. The yearning after costly docks for the accommodation of ships that may never be built, and the clamours for a hebdomadal reconstruction of the navy on principles that have never been tested, are not the results of any deliberate or settled estimate of affairs, but the mere caprices of an unreflecting prodigality. For there is an expenditure which depends on passion, as well as an expenditure which depends on policy; and it does not follow that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should forget the distinction because the Leader of Opposition habitually denies it.

Sir Stafford  
Northcote's  
attack on Mr.  
Gladstone.

The parliamentary attack on the Manchester speech was entrusted to Sir Stafford Northcote, who opened the debate on the second reading of the Customs and Inland Revenue bill, on the 9th of May. His charges against Mr. Gladstone in connection with it were three:—1. that he had repudiated his ministerial responsibility for the expenditure of the country; 2. that he had neglected to provide a proper surplus for the year; 3. that he had taken away the taxes by which such a surplus would have been provided. The first charge was sufficiently disposed of by Mr. Gladstone's formal acceptance of the full responsibility for the expenditure. The two others involve questions of a less personal nature.

A surplus of a certain amount is simply another term for the reduction of the national debt by that amount; and therefore, to maintain that a surplus should always be provided, is to maintain that no circumstances should interfere with the provision of a sinking fund for the discharge of the national debt. Now the financial object of reducing the national debt is to save the interest payable on it; and hence, by raising a surplus of revenue, the country purchases relief from a certain annual charge, by sinking an equivalent capital. This is reasonable and sound when the finances are in a normal state, but it is neither the one nor the other when the expenditure of the country is raised to a very extraordinary height; and the propriety of a surplus at the present moment depends, therefore, on the question whether our present expenditure of 70,000,000*l.* a year in time of peace is normal or extraordinary. Mr. Gladstone says it is "exceptional;" Mr. Disraeli rejects the epithet, but declares the thing "insufferable;" and if, as a nation, we cannot bear to raise a revenue of 70,000,000*l.* a year, it is certainly difficult to see how we could bear to raise the same revenue with the addition of two or three millions for surplus.

Sir Stafford Northcote's solution of the difficulty is only another version of the answer which Tory financiers, for the last sixteen years, have opposed to every step in the development of that "wise, just, and beneficial" policy the adoption of which destroyed the old Conservative party. He reviews the financial arrangements of last year, and, raising no objection to the reduction of the income-tax by 1,000,000*l.*, denounces the abolition of the paper-duty as a loss of 1,200,000*l.* to the revenue, and says that this 1,200,000*l.* would have given us a respectable surplus. It is disheartening, when we have reached the last step in a great reform which has been unfolding itself through half a generation, to find ourselves compelled to turn round and vindicate its first principles against those who profess to be its friends. Sir Stafford Northcote calls himself a free-trader; but he still needs to be reminded of the elementary truth, that to liberate trade is to extend it, to increase the number of those to whom it gives employment, to improve the condition of those with whom it has points of contact, and so to give back to the revenue, in other forms, the cost of its original emancipation.



The abolition of the paper-duty was virtually the crowning act of our free-trade policy. It is combined, in one whole, with the other financial measures which were brought forward in 1860. And though there is no statistical machinery by which we can trace this 1,200,000*l.*, and see precisely what portions of it have come back to the revenue through new or unaccustomed channels, still the teaching of science is confirmed by our experience in analogous cases; and the fact is patent that, in spite of two bad harvests and a cotton famine, the revenue since 1860 has been annually retrieving itself at the rate of nearly a million; so that, even if the 1,200,000*l.* were swept away as utterly as Sir Stafford Northcote supposes, we might still expect to recover the loss by the end of another year.

A discussion on the budget could have no tendency to raise the reputation of Tory finance; and as soon as Mr. Gladstone had scalped Sir Stafford Northcote "with all possible courtesy, but with all possible decision," Mr. Disraeli turned on the pivot of his favourite dictum, that "expenditure depends on policy," and transferred the debate to the subject of our foreign relations. "Why are we arming?" he exclaimed. "There are three causes for which England may arm. She would arm for self-defence; she might arm to obtain a great object of material importance; and she might arm to maintain her due influence in the councils of Europe." Since Mr. Disraeli became a minister, he has expressly told the world that though he sits in an assembly which annually votes the estimates, the budget, and the Mutiny Act, he is "not ashamed" to maintain the old Tory doctrine that a large standing army is dangerous to the liberties of the country. Naturally, therefore, he disposed of the first of his three alternatives by declaring the Militia, the Volunteers, and the Channel fleet, enough for our national defence; and then, having summarily dismissed the second, he threw himself into the question of keeping up our costly armaments in order to maintain our influence in the councils of Europe.

The argument was this:—The councils of Europe mean practically England and France; for all the other great powers are in a state of collapse. Your armaments, therefore, are directed against France; and yet France is a power with whom you profess to have a cordial alliance, and with whom you have just concluded a commercial treaty. We opposed the treaty on this side of the House, but not on any ground of principle or policy; "it was a question of opportuneness and of our financial ability." All parties approve the alliance with France. Our interests are the same as hers, commercially and politically, in all parts of the world; especially they are so in America, on which we both depend for a supply of cotton, and in Italy, where we both have the same objects in view, though we wish to attain them in different ways. The details of the Italian settlement, therefore, are the only points of difference between us. France wishes to see an independent power in Southern Italy, as

eminent statesmen on the ministerial side of the House also do or did wish. She further desires to keep the Pope at Rome; and, as friends to the Emperor Napoleon, we ought to favour the execution of that wish, because the Pope's being "a fugitive, an exile, and a prisoner" is a "circumstance" which "the ruler of France" "could not afford to view . . . with indifference, perhaps not with impunity." If we would only pursue a conciliatory instead of an irritating and insulting policy towards France on these points, we might at the same time soothe Mr. Cobden and his followers by the reduction of our armaments; while "a virgin income-tax" would save the pockets of the landed interest, and constitute a financial reserve worth more to us in any great emergency than all our fleets and armies.

That we are really multiplying iron ships and Armstrong guns to crush the independence of Southern Italy, and to drive the Pope from his capital, is a view of affairs which bears all the impress of Mr. Disraeli's fatal ingenuity; and the notion that our concluding a commercial treaty with France is inconsistent with our maintaining armaments against the possible designs of any "ruler" she may happen to have, is only another instance of that utter misconception of the true nature of the French alliance for which his speeches on the subject have always been conspicuous. The aim and effect of the commercial treaty is so to interweave the social interests of the two countries as to make it more and more difficult for political passion to tear them asunder. Questions of dynasties and forms of government it leaves precisely where it found them. Questions of international politics it affects only so far as this,—that by means of it each country gives the world fresh pledges for a pacific policy. It is essentially an alliance with the French nation. But Mr. Disraeli's idea has always been that of a dynastic alliance. It is "the ruler of France" who is always in his thoughts, and the primacy of Napoleon the Third in European politics, by which he would have us secure our own supremacy in other quarters of the world. There is nothing in the policy of the commercial treaty which bids us stoop to such a compact as this. It is in no sense a treaty of partition. If it endures, there is little doubt that, in years to come, we shall be able to make great and permanent reductions in our armaments. But that is a result which will equally follow, whoever may be the future ruler of France; and the importance of securing it is really one more added to the mass of arguments by which our preparations for defence have hitherto been justified.

Real meaning  
of Mr. Disraeli's  
Speech.

In point of fact, however, Mr. Disraeli's speech was not intended as a serious exposition of policy. It was merely an attempt to solve the problem: given the Tories, the Economists, and the Catholics; to combine them in a vote against the Government. Since the days of the Irish coercion bill, problems of this sort have had a standing fascination for Mr. Disraeli; their solution constitutes his method in politics; and he sets himself to work them out with an energy and



systematic relentlessness which never succumb either to failure or principle. The process is simple and invariable. It is merely to ascertain what part of the Tory tradition is crossed by the essential demands of the different parties to be conciliated, and then to ascertain at what price the Tory party will sell that part of its tradition. In the present case, however, it soon became obvious that Mr. Disraeli's followers were not prepared to accept his terms. Hitherto, when he has induced them to enter into a combination of this kind, it has been with an immediate prospect of obtaining office, or an immediate danger of losing it; and the tenure of office has been theoretically supposed to involve the power of carrying out a policy, —that policy being further supposed to be founded on the convictions of the party. A veil has thus been thrown over the coarser features of the contract; and the sacrifice of principle has been made for the advantage of a cause, rather than of the individuals who represent it. But in May there was no question of a Tory Government coming into office; and the Tory members, therefore, were brought face to face with the naked proposal to place the country at the mercy of French forbearance in order to deliver themselves from the income-tax. That they would revolt at the word of command when it came to them in such a tone as this, would have been certain beforehand to a leader whose own perceptions had not been dulled by long trifling with the principles of his followers. But, in fact, Mr. Disraeli never expected them to take him at his word. Beyond a general subservience to the Emperor of the French, there is probably no part of his programme which it would enter into his calculations as a minister to make any attempt to carry out; and he no doubt supposed his own party would understand that he was merely shaping his promises according to the needs of the moment, and leaving his real policy to be evolved from the course of events.

The supposition was reasonable, but it proved to be mistaken. Eleven days afterwards, when the Bill was read a third time, it had become necessary to explain away the greater part of the programme; and Mr. Disraeli then announced his conviction that it was our duty to maintain our naval supremacy at all hazards, and without hesitation to avail ourselves of "every real improvement in naval warfare," and "every sound application of scientific discovery that may conduce to our strength." These phrases cover every item of the present army and navy expenditure, about which there could be any controversy. And as language in the same sense was employed by Lord Derby, when the financial measures were discussed in the House of Lords, on the 31st of May, there ceased to be any doubt of the failure of the combination, as far as the Economists were concerned.

Meanwhile, however, Mr. Stansfeld, if he had not exactly taken Mr. Disraeli at his word, had prepared to test his sincerity by a motion, "That the national expenditure is capable of reduction without compromising the safety, the independence, and the legitimate

Debate on  
Expenditure,  
and question  
of Confidence.

influence of the country." This motion was announced almost immediately after Mr. Disraeli's first speech, and of course had its influence in the production of his second. It came on for discussion on the 4th of June, accompanied by amendments, and with the following substitute proposed by Lord Palmerston: "That this House, deeply impressed with the necessity of economy in every department of the State, is at the same time mindful of its obligation to provide for the security of the country at home and the protection of its interests abroad. That this House observes with satisfaction the decrease which has already been effected in the national expenditure, and trusts that such further diminution may be made therein as the future state of things may warrant." This amounted to an expression of confidence in the Government, and contained a direct affirmation of that progressive diminution of expenditure which, during the financial debates of the session, had so often been denied by the Opposition speakers. As soon as it was placed on the paper, a meeting of Lord Derby's supporters was held, and an amendment drawn up reflecting directly on Mr. Gladstone. This amendment was ultimately entrusted to Mr. Walpole, who was not present at the meeting, and seems to have been to some extent unaware of what passed at it. His expectation apparently was, that the Government would throw Mr. Gladstone overboard, either by accepting an amendment which was especially a censure on him, or by remaining in office after it had been carried against them. This of course was out of the question. Lord Palmerston, on the evening of the debate, made a preliminary announcement that Mr. Walpole's attack on the financial policy involved a question of confidence; whereupon, Mr. Walpole disclaimed all desire to disturb the Government, and reserved the power of withdrawing his amendment when the time for a decision should come. Meanwhile the debate proceeded on Mr. Stansfeld's motion, which was lost by a majority of 367 to 65; and after the division Lord Palmerston's resolution was put from the chair. Mr. Walpole then withdrew his amendment, significantly appealing from the authority of Mr. Disraeli's leadership to his own knowledge of Lord Derby's views. Mr. Disraeli retorted, that he himself was perfectly prepared for the consequences of a ministerial defeat, and criticised Mr. Walpole's conduct with extreme bitterness. In the end, Lord Palmerston's resolution was agreed to without a division; and the attempted alliance between the Tories and Economists has thus resulted in a twofold advantage to the Government, —first, in enabling them most unexpectedly to obtain a unanimous vote of confidence from the House of Commons; and next, in exhibiting, with conspicuous clearness, the disorganised condition of their opponents.

**Agrarian  
Outrage  
in Ireland.**

The most prominent feature in recent Irish annals is the revival of agrarian crime. So at least the public has judged; and humiliating as it may be to confess that Ireland has no history, political or industrial, to vie in interest with the calendar of the Special Commission, the



avowal must be made. Is Ireland the only culprit amongst nations? What month elapses in France or England that does not see amongst the millions of their population some frightful example of the passions of cupidity or revenge, having their issues in blood. For nearly ten years Ireland has enjoyed a freedom from crime of which any people in the world might be proud. This peace has been terribly broken. Three murders have been committed in the county of Tipperary and on its confines, under circumstances of signal atrocity. No one can disguise the horror of the fact, or help feeling, as his first and strongest impulse, the desire to see justice promptly and effectually done upon the murderers; but when all is said, these outrages in one circumscribed district form no pretext for impeaching the whole people of Ireland as a brood of assassins; nor do they justify other nations whose proportion of crime is not less, but greater than that of Ireland, in rising to throw a stone at her. Above all, it is a grievous error to imagine, because the old disease has broken out afresh, that the improvement of Ireland is a fable, and that things are now as they were a generation back. In the year 1829 the jokers in *Blackwood's Magazine* spoke with ghastly pleasantry of murder and arson being the favourite pastime of the country, "without which it would look quite cold and comfortless;" and to do them justice, they worked hard, in earnest as in jest, to postpone as long as they could those cold and comfortless times, and to sustain in full vigour the system which nourished those favourite pastimes, the balanced supremacy of Protestant ascendancy and Captain Rock. In the year 1832 the statistics of crime in Ireland were such that we shrink from reproducing the figures. That state of general lawlessness exists no longer. Of course those who knew Ireland, knew very well that the seeds and causes of agrarian outrage were by no means extinct; they knew how far Ireland was from having become the social paradise which it was a sort of fashion to depict it in the English press; and they always felt the possibility of some recurrence of the old crimes, but never to the old extent. And now, when the primary duty of vindicating the law is discharged, there is in these late occurrences much and frequent matter for reflection upon the social state of Ireland.

Mr. Thiebault and Mr. Fitzgerald were both Catholics, and both, we believe, purchasers in the Encumbered Estates Court. The former circumstance would hardly be worth noticing if there were not still many people who imagine, or affect to imagine, that religion entered in some way or other as an element into these acts of atrocity. The truth is, that religion never had the slightest connection with them. If any thing, perhaps a Catholic who became hated, was more likely to be made a victim than a Protestant. But the difference, one way or other, is not worth speaking of. The causes of crime are, and always have been, perfectly apart from sectarian divisions. The other fact is, however, in some degree, worth dwelling on. An idea became prevalent in England that where the

Encumbered Estates Court had done its office, all that was evil in the relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland was to disappear. The notion was natural enough. The pressure on the landlord, from the accumulated debts of generations, having caused so generally a grinding pressure on the tenants to satisfy the creditor, it was a not unnatural hope that the land, having once passed free and clear into the hands of men of wealth and capital, no reason would remain why the tenants should not be dealt with so justly as to remove every sentiment of grievance. In many instances this hope was realised. But one very probable feature of these sales *sub hâstâ* was overlooked. That was, that purchases in the Landed Estates Court should be made extensively as a mere investment of money, and in the sole view of a profitable return. One of the most ordinary statements in a rental in the Court was that the rents of the occupying tenants were low, and could bear to be greatly increased. And the lands were often bought with the resolution to raise the rents, or to evict the occupiers. Now, in spite of the tendency of our time to reduce every thing to matter of commerce,—land, intellect, and all,—it is a false and fatal idea to purchase the status of a landlord as the means *merely* of obtaining so much per cent for capital. When landlordism bases itself upon that foundation alone, it is easy to prophesy its end. It has never been so accepted in England. When that process takes place, which works so admirably in England, when a great merchant or manufacturer turns his savings into broad acres,—he never dreams of getting the same return as from trade or loans, for he has a return in other ways. He buys honour, position, permanence, the creation of a family, the privileges of a gentleman of the county, the prerogative of being a governor of men. For the sake of these, he is well content to submit to his rental being a comparatively small percentage on his purchase money. It is idle to expect to reap from the same soil at once the honours of a landlord and the gains of a usurer. If men deal with their land and their tenantry in the spirit of jobbers, they must look for as little respect as any other jobber, or indeed less. These observations have not any particular reference, least of all to the gentlemen so barbarously murdered, of whose dealings with their tenantry we know absolutely nothing, nor do we insinuate for a moment that any harshness to tenants is to be pleaded as an excuse for such crimes. We are merely dealing with and combating the idea that the moral evil existing in the relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland,—the want of sympathy, affection, and sense of justice,—was or could be removed by the machinery of selling land free from encumbrances.

In the mean time, no one can doubt that the Government were right in issuing a Special Commission for the trial of the criminals at once, on being prepared with due evidence. It is essential that the idea of possible impunity for murder should at the earliest moment be extinguished. And the conduct of the Commission, so far as it has yet proceeded, has been worthy of all praise. Both judges, as



well as the Attorney-General, are Catholics. The Attorney-General, before his promotion to that office, enjoyed for his talents, eloquence, and high moral qualities, a popularity greater than that of any man since O'Connell. A deep love and esteem for him are still strong in the breasts of the clergy and people, although, in the outward signs of popularity, the adverse relations which have grown up between the Catholics of Ireland and the present Government have, of course, told upon the first law-officer of that Government. The fact that he has been selected to be Attorney-General has prevented the breach from being more wide and hopeless than it is; and if any event were to throw him into public life, unconnected with Government, the power which he could exercise would be immense. He has conducted these prosecutions with a skill and moderation which have won applause from every side.

But when the Special Commission closes, and when, in due time the convicted murderers are hanged, what are we to look to in the future? It is as difficult a problem as ever was presented to the mind of a thinker. Legislation can do little, and will not do the little that it can. And if the economic interests of landowners urge them and prevail with them to clear their lands of tenants, or to raise the rents to the highest possible amount, and if it be in that district the feeling of the peasantry rather to front the utmost wrath of man in this world and God in the next, than yield in patience, where is the cure to be? We say in that district, because it should always be remembered that these outrages embrace, after all, but a small portion of the country, and that throughout seven-eighths of the island the tenantry have suffered themselves to be swept off the land by the thousand without a thought of resistance or vengeance.

A good deal of misapprehension exists also as to the extent to which these outrages owe their origin to any general conspiracy or secret organisation. The name of Ribbonism is very commonly used to designate both the moving principle and the working machinery of crime. Now Ribbonism, properly so called, hardly has any existence in the south of Ireland. Its origin and proper home is in the north. It is there a combination amongst the lowest class of Catholics against Orangeism. It is itself the offspring of a prior combination, that of the defenders, who at the end of the last century grew up as a secret confederacy of Catholic peasants against the confederacy of Protestant and Presbyterian peasants, known as the Peep-o'-day Boys, by whom the Catholics were almost driven out of the county of Armagh in the year 1795. The Ribbonmen have succeeded to the defenders, as the Orangemen have succeeded to the Peep-o'-day Boys. But the different fates of the two associations have been remarkable. The Ribbonmen, proscribed from the beginning and throughout by the Catholic Church, by the Catholic political leaders, and of course by the law, have never numbered amongst their members any but the poorest and most ignorant class, never have had the least gleam of intelligible purpose, never have effected any general

combination, but have formed a number of isolated lodges, meeting at public-houses, and using the same stupid and silly passwords that they did half a century ago. To the general cause of Catholic politics they have of course done nothing but mischief; and no party, however extreme, has arisen in Ireland which has not repudiated them. The Peep-o'-day Boys, on the other hand, transformed into Orangemen, preserving, as the base of their pyramid, the same coarse mass of hatred against Catholics, but covering it with pretences of loyalty and hypocrisy of every kind, have come to be grouped and marshalled into one formidable and compact organisation. Ribbonism in the north is of a political or party character, and its stupid passwords, if they have any meaning at all, point to the overthrow of Protestantism and the coming of the French. The thing having, however, spread from the north to the midland counties, where all, or almost all, the peasantry are Catholic, it changes in the latter district its character and objects.

Its objects, instead of being political and religious, are purely social, and it assumes mainly the form of a league of farm-labourers and servants against the farmers, to extort better terms from them by terror; and of course it is regarded by all above the very lowest class with the utmost detestation; but into Munster, so far as any one can learn, Ribbonism has not penetrated, nor does there seem to be any other general conspiracy amongst the peasantry of a cognate kind. The supposed *Vehm Gericht*, which sits in judgment upon a landlord, tries him, condemns him, and selects by lot an executioner to despatch him, is mainly mythical; although the dastardly custom of using hired assassins as the instruments of vengeance has given some countenance to the notion. But, in truth, such a mock judicial procedure would indicate more intelligence than exists amongst the ruffians who perpetrate these deeds. Whatever conspiracies are formed arise, for the most part, out of the particular case, though in one sense there may be said to be a standing and unusual conspiracy of the peasantry, in the sense of the public opinion, which time and fatal circumstances have formed among them, and which neither religion nor the terrible examples of the law have availed to extirpate—that it is a venial offence to slay any one whom they regard as a tyrant or oppressor.

Position of  
the Irish  
Government.

Leaving this miserable theme, the other topic which Irish politics present is the one to which we alluded above, the wide and increasing gulf which has grown between the government and their old allies, the Irish Catholics. This separation is not of yesterday, nor are its causes far to seek. At no time, indeed, was the sympathy between the English Liberals and the Irish Catholics much more than superficial; and yet the Liberals were the only English party with whom even so much as a superficial accordance was possible for the Catholics of Ireland. The obvious point of contact was the conces-



sion by the Whigs (in theory at least) of the full rights of Catholics as subjects to the enjoyment of political power. When O'Connell, on the formation of Lord Melbourne's government in 1835, promised them his support and that of his party, the equivalent offered was (not legislative measures of justice, which the state of parties rendered it impossible to carry, but) a just administration. At that time, notwithstanding Catholic emancipation, the whole administrative system was thoroughly imbued with the old principles of ascendancy. To make a great innovation in this respect, and to give the Irish Catholics practical proof that, so far as the power of the executive extended, they should no longer feel themselves under a ban, was what the government of Lord Melbourne promised, and what, there is no doubt, they made a hearty effort to fulfil. The Marquis of Normanby and Mr. Drummond were, so far as their power extended, as good governors as ever England sent to Ireland; and their short reign showed the spectacle, unexampled before or since, of the people of Ireland ranging themselves with enthusiasm on the side of the Government. When the Tories came into power again in 1841, O'Connell renewed the Repeal agitation. The movement was so powerful, and the faith in its success so strong, not only amongst the masses, but with the young generation, who mingled the inspirations imbibed from O'Connell with those drawn from the history of Ireland, that when the Whigs returned to office in 1846, O'Connell had not the power to bring back to them the support which the people aided him to give between 1835 and 1841. Since 1846 the Whigs have been in power with two short intervals, and almost every event during that time has tended to increase the separation. First came the famine. That visitation was so tremendous that perhaps no government could have successfully grappled with it, and at the same time any government was certain to be held responsible in the minds of the body of the people for the misery that ensued. Yet, while conceding that the calamity was one which might have baffled any human wisdom, it must be owned that there was a degree of doctrinairism and hard theory promulgated by officials—a flaunting of the flag of political economy in the face of a starving people—which, beyond any thing else, served to make the Government odious. Yet even after the famine, and after the state trials of 1848, numbers of the Catholic clergy, and bishops, as well as of the Catholic Members of Parliament, sided with Government, believing that it was a choice between them and the Tories, and that the latter were essentially anti-Catholic. But then came the Papal aggression, and the surpassing folly of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, of which *il tacere e bello*. A sincere effort was then made to form an independent Irish party in Parliament, a conception planned with ability and zeal, but which fell to pieces because it would have required for its execution a degree of political virtue higher than the people possessed, and greater political sense than was possessed by the leaders. All this time, the one feature of the liberal government which always tended towards a reconciliation

with the people, was their tradition of fair administration. There always remained deep in the minds of the Catholics the belief that they would feel a serious change in the whole spirit of the executive if the Tories returned to power. And this feeling would, we venture to think, have at least been sufficient to renew the relations between the Government and at least a considerable portion of the Catholic body, if again the course of foreign affairs had not tended to destroy even what remained of community of feeling, and to make the names of Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell odious in Ireland beyond any modern precedent. Yet the Italian policy of the present Government is one which any minister of England would have been coerced to adopt. No doubt the people of England felt, with regard to Lord Palmerston, that he not only carried out the policy which they wished for, but that his whole heart and will went with it; and the same cause which augmented his English popularity of course still further increased his unpopularity in Ireland. And, above all, the tone of ministers and of the press was so needlessly insulting to the Head of the Church that it stung the Catholics of Ireland to the core.

How powerfully all this acted may be tested by the one fact, that the Catholics of Ireland actually turned to their hereditary adversaries, and shook hands with the Tories upon the basis of a common opposition to the Whigs. In its effects this may not be an evil. It may perhaps modify and give some tincture of impartiality to the Irish administration of the next Tory government; but a permanent union between the Irish Catholics and the Tory party is impossible. One obvious consideration will show this. In Ireland, politics are almost wholly made by religion. With the body of the Irish Protestants, the difference between a Liberal and a Tory government consists in the greater or less degree of power conceded to Catholics, and really in nothing else. That government is to them the best which gives the minimum of power to Catholics. Toryism with them means simply this. As regards general questions, and especially as regards the question of the Pope, their sympathies naturally are far more with Lord Palmerston than with Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli; but they vote with the latter, and would to-morrow join in turning out the former, because they expect to have an Irish administration of a more thoroughly Protestant character.

Now, to suppose that the Tory leaders (however well inclined) could afford to disgust the whole body of their Irish supporters by disappointing them in the dearest desire of their hearts, would be a strange mistake in any calculation of party possibilities. The Irish Catholics are, we suppose, to be invited to unite with the Tories upon the very natural basis of their own exclusion. The thing is a chimera; and three months of a Tory government would scatter it to the winds.



We said that the one hold which the present *ir Robert Peel*. Government retained upon their old Catholic friends was the tradition of a fairer administration. Yet, curious to say, even that last tie has been, if not wholly broken, yet reduced to the slenderest thread. For the personal character and disposition of the present Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland no feeling is entertained amongst all parties but one of respect; but the action of administration in Ireland naturally depends more upon the Chief Secretary, who sits in Parliament, and is in direct communication with the head of the government there, than upon the viceroy. Mr. Cardwell was as excellent a secretary in all respects as we ever sent to Ireland; and nothing, we believe, but the state of occurrences which have been detailed would have prevented his administration from being the most popular of any for more than twenty years. Almost every act of Mr. Cardwell was characterised by justice and courage; and his conduct with respect to the Board of National Education will one day obtain from the Catholics of Ireland the praise which is its due, and which other causes of bitterness have for the present withheld. On Mr. Cardwell's resignation, it was generally believed in Ireland that Mr. Fortescue would be appointed Secretary; and an administration, conducted by him in common with Lord Carlisle and the present Attorney-General, would, we believe, have effected as much towards restoring to the Government the confidence of the Irish as present circumstances render humanly possible. Whether or not it be true, as it has been rumoured, that the appointment of Mr. Fortescue was abandoned through the apprehension that the feeling against the Government would have prevented his return to Parliament, certainly the choice of a substitute has proved unfortunate in the extreme. So strange has been the career of the new Secretary, that many have conceived that he went over on an express mission to accomplish a total and final disruption of all relations between the Government and the Irish Catholics, to conciliate the Protestants, and thus to effect a complete inversion of the relative position of Whigs and Tories in the government of Ireland. This is of course mere nonsense, as any attention to the facts will show. Sir Robert Peel entered on his office with intentions excellent according to his lights; but unhappily his lights, as regards the state of Ireland and the principles of political freedom, were just a gleam removed from entire darkness, and in that darkness he had not the sense to feel his way till light came, but rushed and stumbled to and fro like an impetuous player at blind man's buff. His first mistake and his greatest, if we except his persevering denial of the very real distress in the West, was with respect to the Queen's Colleges. His proposal to extend the action of the Colleges was intended by him neither as an insult nor an injury to the Catholics. Certainly it could not have been meant to conciliate the Protestant party, who were, on the contrary, irritated by the attack on their own institution, Trinity College. Of the solemn condemnation of the Queen's Colleges by the Catholic Church, and of the foun-

datation of the Catholic University, Sir Robert Peel in all probability had hardly heard, so total was his ignorance of Irish matters. He knew that his father had founded the Government Colleges to provide education for the middle classes of Ireland, and he thought it would be a liberal as well as a filially pious act to extend and support them. This naturally excited the indignation of the Catholic hierarchy, and elicited a reference to the anti-Catholic spirit of the man, as shown by his previous acts and words; and, on the other hand, Sir Robert Peel, who, with talents and energy, has not a grain of prudence or self-control, committed himself in foolish and defiant speeches, which have rung from end to end of Ireland. And to this he has added all the offence of an over-confident and uncconciliating manner. If ever the foundations are to be laid of a renewal of the old alliance between the Irish Catholics and that party whose principle (however defaced) is or was that of governing Ireland by ideas of equal justice and a free career to all, the choice of a very different secretary must be one of the first conditions.

This *levée de boucliers* of Sir Robert Peel in favour of the Queen's Colleges has reacted powerfully in favour of the Catholic University. And here again the opposition of the Government to an act of simple justice—the giving to the University the power of granting degrees—has told most mischievously upon them. Sir Robert Peel no doubt conscientiously believes, and Lord Palmerston also,—although they do not venture to announce it as applicable to England,—that mixed education is a preferable thing to separate education, and that it is great bigotry in Catholics to desire that the collegiate education of their children should have religion for its basis. They may so believe; but to impose these ideas by the power of the State, to deny to those who differ from them the right to educate their sons according to their own conscientious convictions, although they do not ask a penny from the State, and only desire the power of granting degrees, that those educated in their university may not be placed under circumstances of civil inferiority to those educated in other countries, is in plain terms persecution. It is in substance the same principle which in the time of the penal laws proscribed Catholic education altogether. An active movement in favour of a charter to the Catholic University has begun amongst the corporations of the several cities and towns of Ireland, and no doubt it will form one of the popular demands and tests at the next general election. It is so plainly and simply just that it cannot in the end fail of being conceded.

The Pastoral Letter in which the Pope invited  
**Rome.** all the Bishops of the Christian world to Rome for the canonisation of the martyrs of Japan was published in France without previous communication with the government. Cardinal Antonelli was asked for explanations, and replied that the letter was only a friendly invitation, not obligatory, and that the ceremony was to be purely religious. On this the *Moniteur* of Feb. 20 contained an invitation to the Bishops not to quit their dio-



ceses, nor to ask permission to travel out of France, unless serious diocesan interests should call them to Rome. On receiving the assurance that the summons to Rome had a purely ceremonial, and not a political object, the Emperor did not insist on his wish to prevent the French clergy from attending.

The recall of General Goyon from Rome in the middle of May, and the victory of M. de Lavalette, who returns thither as ambassador, was supposed, by the partisans of the two men, to be an announcement of the speedy settlement of the Roman question. General Goyon had persuaded himself that he was the main pillar of the temporal power. But the change was only an outward concession made to the Italians, like the withdrawal of part of the garrison of Rome, and the visit of Prince Napoleon to his father-in-law at Naples. The Emperor of the French is compelled occasionally to make a demonstration of this kind, in order to cover his occupation of Rome, which will probably be prolonged while the Pope lives. There was no change of system announced in the first instructions which were drawn up for M. de Lavalette.

On Whitsunday, June 8, at St. Peter's, the Pope, attended by 44 Cardinals, 243 Bishops, multitudes of priests, and the diplomatic body, solemnly canonised the twenty-seven martyrs of Japan. On the day after, a consistory was held, and an allocution delivered; after which Cardinal Mattei read an address to the Pope, signed by 265 Bishops, 21 of whom are Cardinals.

The allocution is one of great importance, not only from the solemnity of the circumstances which accompanied it, but from the matters of which it treated. While it refrained from encouraging the notion that would make the temporal power one of the doctrinal developments of Christianity which belong to the sphere of faith, and are capable of being erected into dogmas, it was especially directed against the similar but contrary error of those dogmatic fanatics of irreligion and heresy who would erect into a philosophic principle the essential incompatibility of spiritual and temporal power, of sacerdotal and lay jurisdiction, and of the spheres of the natural and supernatural; and would do this on the ground, not of accidental abuses, of external circumstances, of historical difficulties, and of temporary expedience, but on grounds which attack the very root of religion, and logically imply the non-existence of God. Hence the Pope does not, as it has been said, declare that all who doubt the expedience or possibility of maintaining the present form of government at Rome are therefore infidels and atheists. But he formally condemns that peculiar kind of opposition to the present political situation of Rome which is founded on and implies infidel principles. In the allocution, the mutual connection of these principles is traced with great power, and the doctrines of the school from which they emanate are arranged in a systematic order. The errors expressly condemned are as follows:

1. The denial of the necessary coherence which intervenes between the natural and supernatural orders, and a consequent dis-

figurement of the real genius of Revelation, and of the authority, constitution, and power of the Church.

2. The assertion that philosophy, morals, and law may be, and ought to be, independent of Revelation and the authority of the Church; and the denial, which this assertion implies, of the divine origin of truth, law, power, and right.

3. The denial that the Church is a true and perfect society, endowed by its Divine Founder with freedom, and with power over its own laws; the assertion that it is the province of the civil power to define what are the laws of the Church, and the limits within which she can exercise her rights; and the practice, founded upon this assertion, of insisting that the civil power should interfere in matters of religion, morals, and spiritual government, and should regulate the intercourse of Bishops and Clergy with the Pope.

4. The assertion that Pope and Clergy, as ministers of Revelation, should be altogether excluded from all dominion and jurisdiction in temporal matters, because Revelation is not useless only, but injurious to human progress and perfection; because it is something imperfect in itself, and its development is only a part of the continual and indefinite progress of human reason, the miracles of Scripture being only poetical fabrications, the sacred mysteries the sums and symbols of philosophical systems, the sacred histories myths, and our Lord Himself a symbolic fiction.

5. The revolutionary dogma that the laws of morals have no divine sanction; that there is no necessity for human laws to conform to the natural law, or receive any sanction of obligation from God; and that no divine law exists.

6. The denial of the action of God upon mankind and the world; and the doctrine that human reason, independent of God, is the only judge of truth and falsehood, good and evil, and is a law to itself, intrinsically sufficient to provide for the good of the individual and of society.

7. The "primary law," deduced from the principle that all religious truth is derived from the native energy of human reason, which permits each man to think and speak freely of religion, and to practise that kind of worship which best suits his idiosyncrasy and individual temperament.

8. The conclusion of all the foregoing affirmations and denials; which is, to deny the existence of one supreme, all-wise, all-provident Divine Will, distinct from the Universe: to confound God with Nature, and thus to make Him liable to change: to assert that God becomes man, and developes into Nature; that God is all, and all is God; that natural substances have the nature of God; that God and the world are identical, and consequently that spirit and matter, liberty and necessity, truth and falsehood, justice and injustice, are all the same; that authority consists only in the preponderance of numbers and material strength; that right is convertible with fact; and that duty is an empty name.



9. The substitution of the false rights of might for the true and legitimate right, and the subjection of the sphere of morals to that of matter; the denial of all power but that resident in matter, and of all virtue but economy and the production of wealth and enjoyment.

10. The invasion of all rights of property; and the theory that some unlimited right, residing in the state, is the fount and origin of all other rights.

After recounting these "errors," the Pope denounces certain "falsehoods and frauds" of the day. The first is the "hypocrisy" of the "free Church in a free State" as practically exemplified by the Italian and Portuguese governments. The second, the conspiracy against the temporal government of the Holy See, on which subject the allocution teaches as follows: "This civil principality of the Holy See was given to the Pope of Rome by an especial design (*consilio*) of divine providence, and is necessary in order that the same Pope of Rome, being never subject to any prince or government, may exercise in perfect freedom throughout the whole Church the supreme power and authority of feeding and ruling which he has received from Christ our Lord, and may provide for the greater good, utility, and needs of the same Church and faithful people."

Then the Pope "denounces, proscribes, and condemns most especially all the errors above enumerated as utterly repugnant and directly opposed, not only to the Catholic faith and doctrine, and to the precepts of God and the Church, but also to eternal and natural law and justice, and to right reason." And he directs the Bishops to remove from the eyes of their flocks pernicious books and newspapers which contain them, and to watch lest the teaching of literature and the exact sciences may be made a means of propagating matter contrary to faith or morals.

After the reading of the allocution, the Bishops' address was read by Cardinal Mattei. This address is said to be a compromise between one which took the violent course of recommending that major excommunication should be at once pronounced against the chief enemies of the temporal power by name, and one still more moderate than the present. The opening paragraphs are certainly unfortunate. The Bishops, however, content themselves with expressing in general terms their adherence to the condemnation of the theories which the Pope had denounced, and they enlarge upon the question of the temporal power. "We recognise the temporal power of the Holy See," they say, "as a necessary and manifestly providential institution, and we hesitate not to declare that, in the present state of human affairs, the temporal power is quite requisite for the good and free government of the Church and of souls." They quote the former declarations of Pius IX., and conclude that it is "most certain that it was not by chance that this temporal government was conferred on the Holy See, but that it was given to it by a special divine ordinance, in a long succession of years, with unanimous consent of kingdoms and empires, and was confirmed and consolidated by means little

short of miraculous." They also adopt the Pope's declaration that "the temporal possessions and rights of the Roman Church belong to the whole Catholic world," and beseech him to remain steadfast in defending them. "Such is the request which the faithful, dispersed through all the countries of the world, make to you; they desire only free access to you, and freedom to obey the dictates of their conscience. Such, in conclusion, is the request which civil society itself makes to you, feeling that its own foundations are tottering, should your government be subverted." They define the temporal power in the past to have been a providential ordinance; for the present to be necessary to secure freedom of access and communication between the Pope and the Bishops; while for the future they of course say nothing, except that the temporal power is necessary as a means to a certain practical end, the Papal independence.

The Bishops' address, besides provoking a counter-address in the Chamber at Turin, is said to have caused Napoleon III. to give fresh instructions to M. de Lavalette. These, however, can only relate to his personal behaviour, as there can be no question of withdrawing the French troops from Rome. In fact, nothing political has been done. Atheists, Pantheists, Communists, Philosophic Democrats, Socialists, and Utopists of all schools, have been condemned. But the stigma has been affixed to positive theories and doctrines, not to practical doubts and difficulties, or hesitations about the choice of means for a particular purpose.

#### **Turin.**

The Piedmontese government makes but little progress in reconciling any of the three sections of its opponents,—the Clergy, the South Italians, and the Republicans. Victor Emmanuel visited Naples in May, and was received with a tumultuous enthusiasm, which was but the superficial veil of a profound indifference; while the visit which Prince Napoleon paid there to him and to his minister Ratazzi re-awakened all the old suspicions of a fresh dismemberment of Italy in favour of France, by the cession of Sardinia, or even of Genoa. On the 2d of April, Consul Bonham wrote to Lord Russell: "There continues to be great discontent in Naples, and undiminished jealousy of northern Italians; still, in many respects, there is progress and material improvement." On the 17th, a few days before the royal visit, he gives information which throws some light on the depth and sincerity of the applause with which the King was received: "The appointments in the higher courts appear to give tolerable satisfaction; not so those in the inferior or district courts. I must state, however, that at the present time the people of Naples are not in a temper to be much pleased with any thing emanating from Turin. There is great discontent; and as the realisation of the hopes, long entertained, of 'Italia Una,' with Rome for the capital, appears more and more remote, so does this discontent become more intense, and the jealousy of being ruled from Turin more decided. I believe,



however, that these feelings are much more general in Naples than in the provincial towns."

The old Neapolitan troops which had been draughted into the Italian army had caused much anxiety in April; those of them that were quartered in the neighbourhood of the Austrian frontier had deserted in large numbers; and a conspiracy, suspected or discovered, had caused the arrest of some forty of them at Milan on the 28th or April. In the south, the sentiment of Italian unity is partly neutralised by hatred for the Piedmontese, who are to the Italians in general what the Scotch were to the English in the times of James I. and of Lord Bute. Garibaldi has lost much ground among them through his prophetic pretences. The influence which he aspires to exercise is of the same kind as that which Abd-el-Kader exerted over the Arabs. More than a year ago he set himself up as competitor against the Pope, declaring himself to represent the true genius of Christianity, and the Pope-King to be only Antichrist. The Neapolitans laughed at him, but they have remembered his words.

In the north, his party use his influence in favour of their republican projects. If he couples the name of Victor Emmanuel with that of Italy, it is only as the revolutionists, in 1847 and 1848, shouted for "Pio Nono," while they refused to shout for the "Santo Padre." They accepted the person, while they repudiated the office. Garibaldi, in spite of his nominal subjection to the government, affects almost a royal style in his rescripts, and seems to claim the right to declare war when and how he chooses.

Before Ricasoli fell, he had invited Garibaldi to come from Caprera to aid in the national armament, and organise rifle-practice. Some battalions were raised at Genoa; and Ratazzi, who had succeeded Ricasoli, appointed Garibaldi's son to the command, openly exacting a declaration that the object of the armament was none other than to combat southern brigandage. At the same time a secret representation was made through a secretary of Signor de Pretis, the Garibaldian member of Ratazzi's cabinet, that these troops, which consisted to some extent of foreign refugees already burdensome to the Italian government, were destined for some expedition beyond sea; on this, a promise was given that a million of francs should be forthcoming for their expenses. This took place early in April.

After a time, the young men at Genoa had spent their money, and had to return to their homes in Lombardy and elsewhere. Before they separated, Garibaldi, according to the letter he sent to the Chamber on the 3d of June, advised them to keep up their rifle-exercise and their drill at home. The consequences were, a collection of armed bands on the Tyrolese frontier, a movement of the Austrian troops, an energetic remonstrance from the Emperor of the French, the arrest of Colonel Nullo and Signor Cattabeni, with their volunteers, at Pallazuolo and Trescorre, an attempt by the mob to rescue them at Bergamo, and a collision between the soldiers and the people at Brescia. According to the *Opinione Nazionale*, these troops

were intended to make a diversion in the Tyrol, while the main body of volunteers were to join the Greek insurgents, to penetrate Turkey, to raise a conflagration in the Ottoman Empire, and then to cross the Danube into Hungary, to raise the Magyars, Slaves, and Roumans of the southern provinces of Austria, the Bohemians, and the Poles; and thus to threaten the Austrian army of Venice in the rear, while Italian Tyrol was raised by Colonel Nullo and his volunteers. This basket of eggs was broken by the arrest of the colonel and many of his followers on the 14th of May. They had acted in exact conformity with General Garibaldi's instructions, as he published letters to declare; but they were secured in the citadel of Alessandria, and were only set free on the 12th of June, after the danger had passed. This was the foundation of the parliamentary struggle between Signor Ratazzi and the Garibaldians, on the 3d, 4th, 5th, and 6th of June, which terminated in a majority of 189 to 33 in favour of the minister. The childish vanity and affectation of Garibaldi's missive to the Chamber spoiled his cause from the first. The history that came out during the debate proves that Signor Ratazzi used Garibaldi as his lever to raise him into power, and was lavish of vague promises to the party of action, which seemed to countenance the project of an attempt against Austria in the spring. This was probably in order to turn the attention of the party away from Rome, and to encourage the most troublesome members of it to run into certain destruction. The consequence was a great stir among the Venetian, Italian, and Hungarian patriots. Austria complained; France could no longer connive. Then came the mission of Sanfront, the King's aide-de-camp, to Garibaldi, on the 10th of April, the arrest of Nullo on the 14th, and the disavowal of any complicity with Garibaldi on the 3d of June, which made a wide breach between Signor Ratazzi and the Garibaldians, and seemed to force the minister into the ranks of the Conservatives, or at least to force them to join him, even though he took the opportunity still further to assimilate the Italian to the French constitution, by proposing a new law on associations borrowed from the Code Napoléon. A government which denies liberty to religious associations cannot in the long-run respect any other kind of liberties.

Against the clergy the war has been carried on without any cessation. On the 17th of April there appeared a notification from the minister of grace, justice, and worship, that no Italian bishop would be allowed to go to Rome for the ceremony of Whit-Sunday. On the 8th of June, the Minister of Finance, after announcing for 1862 a deficit of 500,000,000 lire, diminished by new taxes to 225,000,000, proposed to supply it in part by the sale of certain Church property, "the value of which greatly exceeds the entire deficit;" and on the 18th of June the following reply to the Bishops' address to the Pope was voted by the Deputies as an address to the King: "The bishops assembled at Rome have cast grave insults upon our country; they have denied our national right, and have invoked foreign violence.



Let us reply by proclaiming our determination to maintain intact the national right of the metropolis of our country, suffering violence at the hands of masters whom she repudiates. The words pronounced at the Vatican have declared all negotiations impossible. This language removes every ground for the hesitation which has long shown the moderation of the Italian people. When ecclesiastics, forgetting their ministry, put forth wishes for political reaction—when ruffians carry desolation from the pontifical territory into the southern provinces, Europe ought to be convinced that the authority of the Italian King and people alone can settle the Roman question."

The Hessian question has been the ground on which the new conservative government in Prussia has endeavoured to assert its influence in Germany, and so to obtain popularity at home, where the adverse issue of the elections in May compelled it to rely on the crown alone for support, and to seek the means of disarming the general opposition by appealing to the most universal feeling of Prussian ambition.

The Landgraves of Hesse owed their position in Germany to their activity in support of the Protestant cause. Having been in the sixteenth century champions of the Saxon Reformation, they joined the Calvinists at the beginning of the seventeenth, and were followed without resistance by their people. Like all the secular princes in the empire, they obtained and collected their states by the law of inheritance, without any popular or national connection, and their power was almost absolute. The first constitutional change was introduced in the middle of the eighteenth century, when it was discovered that the heir-apparent had been for several years secretly a Catholic. The government and the people were united in their attachment to the Protestant religion, and the hereditary prince was compelled to enter into a compact for its security, as the condition of his own succession. He swore that he would allow his children to be brought up Protestants; that he would alter nothing in the laws relating to religion; that he would never tolerate Catholicism, or acquire territories with a Catholic population, or ally himself with a Catholic power. This act of assurance, guaranteed by the Protestant powers, was further secured by the confirmation of all existing rights, and by the concession that the estates should be allowed to assemble at their pleasure and without the consent of the sovereign. In this way the power of the crown was abridged without any resistance or dispute, as the reigning Landgrave was more anxious for the maintenance of his religion than for the authority of his successor. This measure was strongly opposed to the absolutism of the age; and the Catholic princes of the empire protested that the Prince of Hesse would be deprived of his sovereignty, and reduced to a position inconsistent with the imperial laws and with the honour and dignity of the crowns. The government of Hesse was already an anomaly in the Germanic system.

In the Seven Years' war the Catholic Landgrave Frederick took part with Prussia, and received large subsidies from England. The question arose, whether this money belonged to the sovereign or the state. It grew rapidly in amount, for the Hessians were good soldiers, and were preferred to the troops of Wirtemberg, Gotha, and other territories, that were also sold to foreign countries. In the war of the Pragmatic Sanction one Hessian corps served under the Emperor Charles VII., and another against him; and the Landgrave was paid by both sides. During half a century the Hessians were used by England in every war, and 4000 of them were sent to the colonies so late as 1794. The warlike and adventurous people of Hesse submitted without reluctance to the wholesale traffic in their blood. The wealth procured by these subsidies gave their ruler an importance, and invested his court with a splendour, which the land itself could not supply. It relieved the burdens of the taxpayer, whilst it added to the money in circulation, and stimulated expenditure and the demand for labour. But the Estates required a security that these vast sums, amounting at the time of the Revolution to upwards of three millions sterling, should be devoted to public purposes, and should be regarded as the property of the community. The loyalty of the people, however, remained unshaken; and in the revolutionary wars they were ardent enemies of the French. In 1803 the Landgrave was made an Elector; and the title remains, though Hesse is the only electorate created since the last election. In 1806 he held aloof from Prussia, but refused to join the Confederation of the Rhine. Napoleon consequently expelled him from his dominions, and made them part of the kingdom of Westphalia. The Elector retired to Bohemia, and left his treasure in the hands of a Frankfort Jew, whose honesty and ability in discharging the trust laid the foundation of the great fortunes of the house of Rothschild. The electorate became part of a large kingdom; underwent all the changes which the French administration introduced, and lost its separate existence and its ancient institutions. The people resisted the new system, though they learned to appreciate in detail the removal of many abuses, and many evils incident to the petty states of Germany. While they retained their allegiance to their former sovereign, they were reconciled to many improvements in the administration; and many private interests became identified with the new order of things. When the French were expelled, the Hessians welcomed the return of the Elector as their national deliverance, and only wished to recover their old political liberties in conjunction with the social emancipation conferred by the French.

William I. returned to his reconstituted principality with his old ideas unchanged, and with a resolution to restore the former state. Nothing, he declared, was changed, only he had slept for seven years. In due time every trace of the French occupation was obliterated with an energetic perseverance. The old feudal rights of the nobles, the medieval restrictions on the trade of the middle class, and on the



freedom of the lower orders, were revived. All military promotions since 1806 were annulled, and generals returned to the rank of lieutenants; no advancement in the public service during the interregnum was admitted. The world had not gone forward as the Elector wished; he therefore decreed that it had stood still for seven years. The same problem presented itself to the restored princes all over Europe, and the difficulty of the solution ended in almost every case in revolution; but no government dealt with it so unnaturally and stupidly as the Elector of Hesse. So much injustice and discontent ensued, that, although the country remained loyal, the Elector failed even in those portions of his plan of restoration which should have been most popular. The old Estates were summoned, and a project of constitution, the first in Germany, submitted to them. The old claim to the produce of the subsidies, and to the control of the finances, prevented an understanding; for the private income of the Elector greatly exceeded the public revenue. The estates were dismissed, the new constitution was not given, the old one was virtually suspended, and the government raised money at its own will and pleasure. The civil and military service were completely dependent upon it; for the salary of the first could be arbitrarily raised or diminished, and every officer was liable to be dismissed without any reason given.

Yet in the views which guided the restored government of Hesse there was an honourable consistency. The Elector, William I., was not inclined to oppress his subjects, and he endeavoured to be just. In obedience to his last wishes, his son, William II., remodelled the administration of justice in 1821, and emancipated it in great measure from the control of the government. During his reign it was the only bulwark of public law. Every injury inflicted by the government on individuals could be brought before a court of law, whose sentence was independent and respected, and acted therefore as a restraint on the administration. But the system of government was arbitrary, and the court grew very unpopular. The dissolute life of the Elector occasioned the formation of a party of malcontents among the higher classes, who attached themselves to the cause of his injured and insulted wife. Whilst the nobility of the court showed their exasperation in this way, the nobles of the district of Schauenburg protested, through their deputy, against the uncontrolled levying and expenditure of money. The government, they declared, had no right to raise any taxes it might choose. That could not be the intention of a legitimate government; and if it were, the refusal of subsidies by the subjects would be justified. The state could not intend to set up autocratic maxims in the place of legitimacy, which was the security for the rights both of rulers and subjects, and which was the mother of European civilisation, and the surest support of thrones. The resistance of Schauenburg was successful, and stimulated through the whole country the desire for a constitutional security. The revolution of July followed. The

Elector could not resist the popular movement; a national guard was formed; the Estates met in September 1830; and in the following January the famous constitution of 1831 was published. That measure was a result of the false position assumed in 1814, of the contempt and distrust inspired by the Elector, and of his utter prostration and helplessness in the presence of the strong current of democratic feeling throughout Europe during the period which beheld the fall of the Bourbons, the Reform agitation, and the Belgian, the Polish, and the Italian revolutions. It led to the disturbance of thirty years, and to the present crisis. It did much for the settlement of the finances, for the introduction of the liberty of the press, and for the establishment of religious freedom, which had become necessary since the incorporation of several Catholic territories had destroyed the exclusively Protestant character of the state. But in other respects it differed from all monarchical constitutions. William II., instead of resisting the abrogation of his authority, lost heart, surrendered every thing, and gave up the throne, with its responsibility and its troubles, to his son, the present Elector. Thus the cause of the crown was not represented in the construction of the new form of government; and the unpopularity of the sovereign, the reaction after a long oppression, the desire of securities, and the general democratic tendency of the day, combined to form a system virtually inconsistent with monarchy. The Elector was deprived of the supreme military authority; the oath of fidelity to the constitution was imposed on the army; and, in order to make it entirely superfluous, the care of the internal peace of the country was committed to a permanent national guard. The parliament consisted only of a house of representatives of forty members, in which the aristocracy had only eight deputies. It was a system of organised suspicion, inviting the government to resist every advance which should strengthen the popular element by satisfying the just wants of the people, and place the whole system of law and administration in agreement with the new constitution. The national rights were protected by an impracticable law; the sovereign was defied, and reduced to make use of all those irregular means of influence—corruption, intimidation, and administrative violence—which the German bureaucratic system affords, especially in a country where free institutions are a novelty, and must remain an anomaly until they are developed and completed by the combination of the government with the popular feeling. The Hessian constitution was an anomaly not only in the electorate, but in the Confederation; and an appeal to the Diet remained as a resource to the Elector, if he failed by irregular and underhand means to neutralise the effects of the concessions of 1831. This policy succeeded, however, in the period before 1848. Unscrupulous ministers, endeavouring to resist the dangerous and impolitic tendencies of the constitution, rendered it useless for good, and made Hesse the worst-governed state in Germany. In 1848 no excesses occurred; but the liberals came into power, remodelled the constitution, broke down the



power of the nobles, who had been supporters of the government, published in 1849 a democratic electoral law, and threw themselves into the movement for German unity under the Prussian supremacy.

In 1850, therefore, when the conservative reaction prevailed, and the Elector appointed the minister Hassenpflug to restore his authority, and make good the losses of the last two years, the contest extended beyond the question of conservatism and democracy, and connected itself with the rivalry of the two great German powers, which the ignominious failure of the Prussian schemes, and the haughtiness of Austria in the moment of her triumph, had greatly embittered. The Diet, controlled by Austria, sent troops into Hesse to restore order and enforce the will of the new government, while Prussia undertook to defend the constitution. A great army, under Radetzky, was collected in Bohemia, ready to march on Berlin; the Austrians and Bavarians were in presence of the Prussians in Hesse; and some shots had been fired, when Prussia was compelled by the Emperor Nicholas to give way; and the illustrious Radowitz, the soul of the Prussian policy, was dismissed. Austria pursued her triumph at Frankfort. In March 1852 the constitution of 1831 was pronounced by the Diet in contradiction with the fundamental principles of the Confederation, and with the articles of the Treaty of Vienna, and was therefore abolished. The Hessian government, in conjunction with the federal commissaries, then issued a new constitution, with two chambers, and a new electoral law resembling those of other countries. It was rejected by the general feeling of the people. The parliament was elected under protest, demanded the restoration of the old constitution, and was immediately dissolved. Concessions were made by the Elector in 1860, but without effect. The supporters of the constitution of 1831 struggled for a principle, not for its details. That these required modification cannot be questioned, and is not the point in dispute. But the right of the Diet to interfere between the government and people of a particular state was denied, and was deemed most dangerous, inasmuch as it opened the way for the intervention, intrigue, and rivalry of the great powers, and made the internal affairs of an independent state a scene for the conflict of their influence and interests. Further, the changes imposed on the Hessians were due to Austria. But the people of Hesse are attached to Prussia, and during the last ten years the popularity of Austria did not increase, while her authority in Germany diminished. The Hessian opposition was accordingly sustained by Prussia; above all, the thorough distrust entertained for the Elector confirmed the resistance. After 1860 the government began to recede from its former position, and offered, in November 1861, to grant an electoral law nearly approaching that of 1831, accompanied by an increase in the numbers of the upper house. The Elector still insisted that any concessions must proceed from the basis of the new constitution, and not by way of improvement of that of 1831. The people clung to the continuity of the laws of 1831, and Prussia at length brought round the Diet to

the same opinion. In the address with which the parliament was opened at Berlin on the 19th of May, the minister said: "In the question of the constitution of electoral Hesse, the unremitting endeavours of the government have succeeded in causing almost all German governments to come to the conclusion that the constitution of 1831, excepting those stipulations which are contrary to the federal constitution, must be reëstablished; and Austria has joined Prussia in making a common proposal to the Federal Diet, the immediate acceptance of which may now be expected. The new ordinance respecting the elections, which is in direct opposition to this proposal, and which deeply offends the country's sense of right, will not come into operation, in accordance with the express demand of Prussia, and with the request of the Federal Assembly." Austria had given way in this matter in order to put an end to the constant source of disorder and confusion which the electorate has supplied for many years, and which has been an opportunity for the extension of Prussian influence and the promotion of the national party, to whom it served as a convenient means of agitation. Prussia therefore took the lead in obtaining the surrender by the Elector of a position in which he was no longer supported.

On the 12th of May General Willisen arrived at Cassel with a letter from the King of Prussia. He obtained with difficulty an audience of the Elector, who refused to read the letter, and received it so ungraciously that the envoy deemed his sovereign insulted. On the 14th he demanded an apology within twenty-four hours. It was not given, and he left Cassel on the next evening. The Prussian Resident was instructed to demand that the ministry should be dismissed in satisfaction for the insult. This ultimatum was refused; and on the 20th of May Prussia broke off diplomatic relations and prepared two divisions for the invasion of Hesse. Acting under the advice of Austria, the ministry retired on the 26th of May, and negotiations were opened for the formation of an administration on liberal principles. At length, on the 21st of June, a new ministry was formed, consisting, like the former one, of conservatives, but agreeing to restore the constitution of 1831, and the electoral law of 1849. The position is not tenable; but the event is a victory of the Southern influence, and a disappointment to the Prussian party and the Nationalverein, whose object has been throughout to obtain a ministry in Hesse which should play into the hands of Prussia, and pave the way for the abolition of the independence of the electorate.

The States of North America. The armaments which the Government of Washington had leisure to prepare during the autumn and winter, and the many successes gained by them since the active renewal of the war five months ago, have failed to daunt the spirit of the South, to divide their sympathies, or to bring the struggle nearer to its termination. The bearing of the



Southern people in their moments of adversity, when the hopes of English intervention fell, and when their chief city was taken by the enemy, proves far more certainly than their valour in the field that the Union can never be restored by force of arms. Many motives must undoubtedly combine to constitute so strong a unanimity. Even the best cause obtains power only by purchasing with necessary sacrifices the support of men who do not believe in it, and of men who do not understand it. For us, it is more important to recognise the energy than to investigate the nature of the causes which give to the patriotism of the slave-states so much vigour and endurance. Our judgment may be determined by considerations which are involved in the issue of the contest, though not consciously upheld by either contending party; and our view of the general question may be altogether independent of the opinion we form on particular measures or men. The Southern cause is bound up with an infamous and immoral legislation for the better security of the slave-owner; and the defenders of the Union are animated by a just and honourable anxiety to maintain the integrity, the power, and the reputation of their country. But the Northern theory attributes an arbitrary authority to the Government as the representative of the popular will, and makes the Constitution a permanent violation of the principles of right, and an organised system of revolution. If Calhoun had succeeded in substituting a political and constitutional order in the place of this democratic tyranny, the freedom and greatness of the United States might have been preserved. But the absolutist interpretation prevailed against him; the Constitution became incompatible with liberty; and self-government was unattainable except through independence. Slavery in the Southern States is less opposed to the first principles of political morality than are the Northern ideas of freedom. Moreover, its preservation is not entirely optional to the South; the institution of liberty was deliberately rejected by the North. The subjection of man to man is not inconsistent with the nature of society; it is a transient but a legitimate condition of life, and should be regulated and watched by the State, which governs alike the owner and the slave, and protects one against oppression and the other against revenge. The absolute subjection of the individual to the State is against the laws of political morality and the notion of polity. No third power remains to protect right against force, and to assert the claims of duty against the temptations of interest and passion. A community which includes slaves may develop political freedom more fully than one which tolerates an absolute sovereignty. Therefore, the one ruling element in the American war, which reduces all others to comparative insignificance, is the defence of the rights of self-government against the theory that there is a supreme, irresistible, and irresponsible power. Fidelity to the spirit of our own institutions ought to decide the part Englishmen take in such a controversy.

The Confederate Government has vainly reckoned on the dearth

of cotton, the Trent outrage, and the alarm for Canada, to obtain its recognition by England. With a patience which is one of the portents of the age, we have borne the insults and threats of the North Americans, and the privations which are suffered by our industrial population, in order that an incalculable increase of power may accrue to those who, by position, by temper, and by their gradual apostasy from the spirit of our institutions (which the early statesmen of the Republic cherished), have become our irreconcilable antagonists. We suffer in silence while a power which, from the traditions of its history, is more hostile to us than any other, which is accustomed to offend us, and eager to attack our colonies, whose influence has been manifested to the world in the extent to which it has detracted from the dignity and the influence of England, subjugates and ruins a people whose political sympathies are English, whose commercial interests are inseparable from ours, and who look to us as the arbiters of their fate. For the cost of their independence, and the feelings they will hereafter entertain towards England, will be determined by the course she has pursued in their extremity. She could have saved them from the dire necessity of sacrificing social welfare, national prosperity, and domestic happiness, for their political deliverance, till the price of their freedom almost exceeds its value, and till they will learn to consider the cold timidity with which we have looked on their efforts as the cause of miseries which they will feel for generations. One thing there is which no intervention of ours could prevent, and which will not depend on the issue of the war. Whether the Northern Government succeeds or fails, its character is altered, and its power permanently and enormously increased. The Free States alone would be henceforth more formidable neighbours than the United States have ever been. Whatever they may lose in this conflict, they have gained things which, far beyond extent of territory or population, compose the strength of States—concentration and emancipation of the governing power. A mighty army, a navy absorbing nearly the whole mercantile marine, vast military stores, a martial law, a national debt, a heavy taxation, enormous dues,—all things which it was long the object of all constitutional statesmen to prevent,—have now been established without resistance, and have transformed the government. It will be impossible in time of peace to surrender the dictatorial power which this war has conferred on the President. The initiative in administration; the function of universal guardian and paymaster; the resources of coercion, intimidation, and corruption; the habit of preferring the public interest of the moment to the established law; the duty of providing for the gradual return to peaceful life of a whole nation of soldiers trained in the scenes of civil war; a public creditor; a prodigious budget;—these things will remain to the future government of the Federal Union, and will make it approximate more closely to the imperial than to the republican type of democracy. New aspirations will be awakened by the means of gratifying them; for nations are seldom



content with the glory which is acquired in civil war. This is a danger we cannot prevent; but against which we should find a security in the establishment of another great power naturally our ally against it.

Yet, in spite of all these powerful inducements to interfere, in spite of the pressure at home, and of the great imperial interests at stake, England has shown a moderation which ought to be a warning to the North Americans. For if we have manifested no eagerness, no anxiety, and no jealousy, the reason is to be found in our conviction that the Southern Confederacy must inevitably achieve independence. This belief, which has so much excited the wrath of the Federals, has really been the means of preserving for them the neutrality of England. It commenced with the first successes of the Confederates, and has been confirmed during the reverses they have met since the surrender of Mr. Slidell and Mr. Mason, and the completion of the great preparations, enabled the government of Washington to renew hostilities.

The long delay in the conduct of the war by the North excited great discontent, threatened the popularity of General M'Clellan, and led to suspicions that it was partly caused by unfair dealing in the military administration. A committee of the House of Representatives, which investigated government contracts, exposed the system. On the 13th of January Mr. Dawes denounced it in the Congress, and divulged facts which increased the impatience of the public. "Providence," he said, "before six months will dispose of this war, or He will dispose of us. It costs two million dollars every day to support the army in the field. A hundred millions of dollars have been thus expended since we met on the 22d of December, and all the time the army has been in repose. . . . Sixty days longer of this state of things will bring about a result one way or another, and an ignominious peace must be submitted to, unless we see to it that the credit of the country is sustained, and sustained too by the conviction going forth from this hall to the people of the country that we will treat as traitors not only those who are bold and manly enough to meet us face to face in the field of strife, but all those who clandestinely and stealthily suck the life-blood from us in this mighty struggle." To the state of feeling exhibited in this speech some concession was required. The Secretary for War, Mr. Cameron, resigned, and was succeeded by Mr. Staunton, whose appointment was popular, and was soon followed by offensive operations. Mr. Staunton has taken precautions to secure the superiority of the minister over the generals and over the public, which, whatever their military effect may be, betray the extent of the change that has taken place in the position of the central government. By breaking up the army into separate commands, the supreme control of military affairs was transferred to the hands of the civilians at Washington. All republics regard successful generals as their most dangerous enemies,—most of all, republics fighting for existence. Athens saved herself by

ostracism, or by such artifices as were afterwards adopted by Venice; and Venice saved herself by the assassination, banishment, or imprisonment of the captains who served her, and by the law which excluded her citizens from the command in Italy. These are violent remedies against the action of a universal law which created the fortunes of Sylla and Cæsar, of the House of Orange, of Cromwell, and of Napoleon, and which caused Washington to be distrusted, and led to the recall of Fremont. The prohibition to publish military intelligence not sanctioned by the government is not only an attempt to control public opinion, but a means of restraining the ambition and distributing the fame of the several commanders. Under the new arrangement, General Hunter received the command of the Southern department, and General Halleck of the Mississippi. Fremont obscurely commanded the mountain department of Western Virginia, while the army of the Potomac was divided between M'Clellan on the left, M'Dowell in the centre, and Banks in the valley of the Shenandoah, between the Blue Ridge and the district held by Fremont. This was the final arrangement made in the month of March. The execution of the great plan for the invasion of the South commenced early in the year.

The first action was at Mill Spring, in Kentucky, where, on the 19th of January, the Federals gained a victory. This was followed by the invasion of Tennessee. Two rivers, the Tennessee and the Cumberland, flow northward into the Federal territory, and open the way for gunboats into the heart of that State. The first was defended by Fort Henry, the last by Fort Donnelson. A Federal expedition advanced up the Tennessee in the beginning of February, and Fort Henry surrendered to the boats on the 6th. On the 13th Fort Donnelson was attacked by a force of 40,000 men under General Grant. After a resistance of three days, a portion of the defenders made their escape, and the remainder, to the amount of 12,000 men, capitulated on the 16th. After this, the war languished for eight weeks in Kentucky and Tennessee, and the efforts of the Federals were directed to the capture of the forts on the Mississippi and the Atlantic. The Southern army remained all the winter in front of Washington, and it was intended before attacking them to obtain a position in their rear.

On the 11th and 12th of January, a great expedition of 125 ships, carrying a large body of troops under General Burnside, sailed from Hampton Roads, and did not reach its destination off the coast of North Carolina till the 6th of February. Roanoke Island was occupied on the 8th, a Confederate fleet was destroyed, and Elizabeth city fell on the 10th. A month elapsed without further action; but on the 14th of March General Burnside gained a victory at Newbern and occupied Beaufort. The importance of his operations was such that the Confederates retired from the position they had held at Manassas and on the Lower Potomac from the beginning of the war.

In the Far West they had already retreated from Missouri, and



were pursued by Generals Curtis and Sigel into Arkansas. The Confederate General Van Dorn gave battle on the 6th of March at Pea Ridge. On the following day the fight was renewed, and he was defeated, losing 1400 prisoners. The Federals reported a loss of 1350 men. In this battle, a considerable force of Indians served with little effect on the Southern side. The Northern army was composed in great part of Germans from the North-West.

In the midst of these reverses, on Feb. 22d, Mr. Jefferson Davis was installed at Richmond as President of the Southern Confederacy, and sent a message to the Southern Congress on the state of the country. "Events have demonstrated that the Confederate government has attempted more than it has the power to achieve. Hence, in an effort to protect by arms the whole of the Confederate territory, both seaboard and inland, we have been so exposed as recently to encounter serious disasters. The Confederacy when formed was destitute of men to carry on war on so gigantic a scale. It has done all that human power and foresight could do to make up for this deficiency. . . . It has become probable that the war will continue through a series of years. Soldiers generally are reënlisting. A whole body of new levies and reënlisted men will probably be ready in thirty days. The present force may in general be stated at 400 regiments of infantry, with a proportionate force of cavalry. The process of furlough and reënlistments last month had weakened the forces for a successful defence. This evil is now substantially at an end."

A fortnight later, on March 6th, Mr. Lincoln transmitted a message to the Northern Congress, with a plan for the abolition of slavery. He recommended the adoption of a resolution to coöperate with any state that should undertake gradually to abolish slavery, by advancing a sum of money as compensation for private losses and for the public inconvenience which the change would produce. The object of this proposal was to link the Border States to the Union, and thus deprive the South of the hope of obtaining them. "To deprive them of this hope," said Mr. Lincoln, "substantially ends the rebellion, and the initiation of emancipation completely deprives them of it as to all the states initiating it. The point is not, that all the states tolerating slavery would very soon, if at all, initiate emancipation, but that while the offer is equally made to all, the more Northern shall, by such initiation, make it certain to the more Southern that in no event will the former ever join the latter in their proposed Confederacy. I say 'initiation,' because in my judgment gradual and not sudden emancipation is better for all. In the mere financial or pecuniary view, any member of Congress, with the census tables and the treasury reports before him, can readily see for himself how very soon the current expenditures of this war would purchase at a fair valuation all the slaves in any named state." This proposal was adopted by a majority of 88 to 31 in the House of Representatives, and of 32 to 10 in the Senate. But the representatives of the Border States

were among those who opposed it, and the result consequently was to increase the distrust of the Union among the slave-owners of those states. This was further excited by a measure for the abolition of slavery in the district of Columbia, which immediately followed. Both these acts, while it was proclaimed that the war was not carried on for abolition, proved that the Government was prepared to use philanthropy and the terror of a servile war as instruments of conquest.

Active warfare had been suspended for a time, when an event occurred which promised to realise the prophecy of Mr. Davis, "that we may confidently rely on contesting the vaunted control of the enemy over our waters." The iron-plated frigate *Merrimac* came forth from Norfolk on the 9th of March, and attacked the Federal fleet in Hampton Roads. Of the four frigates that were there, two were destroyed and one run aground; when the Federal gunboat *Monitor* diverted the attention of the Confederate vessel, and saved the remainder of the fleet. The *Merrimac* retired to Norfolk, and her exploits were at an end; but the terror she inspired operated for nearly two months to embarrass the Federal movements in those waters. The moment of this great achievement was chosen by the Confederates to withdraw from their position at Manassas. Their President, in his message, had pronounced in favour of greater concentration; and the expeditions of the Federals on so many points of the coast made a more central position necessary for them. The capital was threatened from the sea, and needed to be surrounded by a force that could defend it, on whichever side it might be attacked. The result of this able movement was to concentrate the Southern army, and to divide the Federal forces. At Washington it became known on the 10th of March that the position at Manassas had been abandoned, and the Northern commander ordered a general advance of the army of the Potomac. They found the roads almost impassable, the bridges destroyed, the stores removed, and no provisions for man or beast. The advance of so vast an army over a difficult country, carrying its own magazines, would have been slow, ruinously expensive, and extremely perilous. It was determined to convey the greater part of the army by water to the neighbourhood of Richmond, where the broad estuaries would enable the fleet to coöperate with the army, and where, it was believed, the Confederates had prepared no defences. General McClellan, therefore, returned with the bulk of his force to Washington, leaving General McDowell to pursue the enemy, with so small a force that his advance was necessarily extremely cautious and ineffective. On his right, beyond Blue Ridge, General Banks was attacked near Winchester, on the 23d of March, by the Confederate General Jackson. The Federals were in considerable force, and repulsed the enemy.

On the 5th of April, General McClellan led the main army of the Union from the mouth of the James River upon Yorktown, where it found itself arrested by a powerful fortification extending across the



peninsula. Calling in reinforcements from General M'Dowell, he commenced a regular siege. During the four weeks it lasted, important events occurred at other places. After the fall of Fort Donnelson, the Federal forces under General Grant had advanced up the Tennessee to the frontier of the State of Mississippi, where the Confederates, under General Johnston and General Beauregard, occupied an important position at Corinth, commanding the railways. The armies were twenty-five miles apart. A second Union army was a march in the rear of General Grant. The Confederates attacked him at Shiloh on the 6th of April, and drove him from his position to the river. In spite of the fire of the Federal gunboats, they succeeded in maintaining themselves till the next day, when General Buell appeared on the field, and they retreated to Corinth. The Federals lost 1735 killed, 7882 wounded, 4044 prisoners, and 36 guns. The Confederates lost General Johnston, 1700 killed, 8000 wounded, and 1000 missing. The strategic result of this great battle has been, that the two armies continued to occupy the same position for ten weeks. But they were soon greatly reinforced; General Halleck took the command of the Federals, General Mitchell threatened the communications of General Beauregard on the Eastern railway, while the disasters of the Confederates on the Mississippi have allowed the concentration of an immense force at Corinth.

When the Federal commanders in Tennessee were attacked by General Beauregard, they were waiting for the fall of a fort on Island No. 10, near New Madrid, on the Mississippi, which is on a line with the position at Corinth. The bombardment had opened on the 15th of March, and lasted three weeks, without effect. By cutting a canal twelve miles in length, the Federals succeeded in gaining a position which made the place untenable; and the Confederate garrison surrendered on the 8th of April, to the number of 6000 men. Three days later, Fort Pulaski, on the Atlantic coast, surrendered; and Savannah was threatened. The passage down the Mississippi to New Orleans was still beset with obstacles equal to that which had been so ingeniously overcome at Island No. 10; and the approach to New Orleans from the sea was closed by strong works and a fleet of iron vessels. The Federals attacked them on the 13th of April, and forced their way through on the 25th, after disabling the Confederate flotilla. These forts are sixty miles below the city, which could not be defended. It was evacuated by the Southern army, which proceeded, 25,000 strong, to join Beauregard at Corinth. The Federals, under General Butler, took possession of New Orleans, martial law was proclaimed, and the blockade was raised. It was after this great blow that the determination of the Southern people was most conspicuously exhibited. No Union feeling, no joy at the opening of trade and the end of so many trials and privations, could be discovered. At New Orleans, and at every point on the Mississippi which the Federals could reach, the cotton was destroyed.

Under these circumstances, the French minister at Washington, M. Mercier, visited Richmond, apparently as an unaccredited negotiator between the contending states. The Federal Government took pains to represent his journey as having been undertaken on an understanding with them, and not in pursuance of orders from France.

On the 4th of May the lines at Yorktown were completely evacuated by the Southern army. Seventy-one heavy guns fell into the hands of the Federals, who pressed closely on the enemy. On the 5th there was an action near Williamsburg, with the rear-guard, who retreated after inflicting on their pursuers a loss of 2000 men. At West Point the Federals met with a repulse on the 7th, and were saved by their gunboats. General McClellan advanced slowly upon Richmond, and established communications on his right with McDowell, who had remained for two months inactive, between the Potomac and the Rappahannock. On the 11th the Confederates blew up the *Merrimac*, and abandoned Norfolk, after destroying the navy yard. On the 20th the advance of the Federal flotilla up the James River was stopped, eight miles from Richmond, by the Confederate batteries. The army continued its march upon Richmond at the rate of little more than a mile a day. On the 31st of May the advance on the Chickahominy was attacked with great vigour by the Confederates. The Federal position was taken, but recovered on the following day. Their loss in the two days' battle amounted to 890 killed, 3627 wounded, 1222 missing, and nineteen guns.

Meantime a signal success attended the Southern arms in the valley of the Shenandoah, where General Banks commanded a force of 4000 men, between Winchester and the town of Front Royal, where the Manassas Railway passes through the gap of the Blue Ridge. On the 24th of May the Confederate General Jackson overwhelmed the regiment which held Front Royal, and on the following day, with very superior forces, he drove the main body of the Federals out of Winchester. Banks retreated into Maryland, and the victorious Confederates approached within two marches of Washington. A sudden and universal alarm seized the Federal Government, and a new levy of troops was ordered in the North-eastern states to save the capital. The peril was exaggerated, and the panic did not last. McDowell and Fremont closed upon Jackson from the East and the West, and Banks reëntered Virginia. The Confederates retired, and, after inflicting a severe blow on General Fremont near Harrisonburg, effected their escape.

The great Western army of General Beauregard evacuated Corinth on the 29th of May with such secrecy and expedition that the enemy could not ascertain the direction of their retreat. In the only action they had fought since the battle of Shiloh, they had been victorious against General Pope at Farmington, and they were so strong that General Halleck had not dared to attack them. But the Federal flotilla was advancing on the Mississippi, and the Confederate positions were being successively abandoned, until the 6th



of June, when Memphis surrendered, after a vast conflagration of cotton and sugar.

The ferocity of the contest went on increasing. General Hunter's proclamation emancipating the slaves in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, had no effect on the slave population, and caused great excitement in the Border States. For these reasons, and because it was an act of usurpation on the supreme authority, the proclamation was disavowed by the President. But the proclamation of General Butler at New Orleans, threatening the Southern women with the brutal license of his soldiers as the penalties of any disloyal demonstrations, though it did a great moral injury to the reputation of the Northern arms, was not repudiated. It increased the expectation of European interference; but the English Government persisted in their refusal to offer mediation.

The time has now arrived when this neutrality has ceased to be justifiable on any grounds of political justice or national interest. The fate of the Negro depends less on the issue of the war than on the mode in which it is terminated. Although it is not a war for abolition, and although the North cannot be justly accused of having proclaimed a principle which would unite the worst horrors of a struggle between civilisation and barbarism, yet the restoration of the Union can only be founded either on measures which must create a permanent enmity between the owner and the slave, or on a compromise which would purchase the submission of the South by the prolongation of slavery. Such a result would be equally promoted by the victory of the South, since the Southern statesmen would take measures to prevent their neighbours from obtaining by intrigue what they have failed to obtain by force. There is no reason to believe that, if left to themselves, they would modify the institution on which their wealth depends, which has been the occasion of their achieving independence, and has not worked to their disadvantage in the crisis of their fortunes. The European powers might prevent both of these evil consequences, and secure by the same act the freedom of the South and the practical deliverance of the slaves. They could prevent the extension and the perpetuation of slavery; they could obtain the abrogation of that infernal code which makes moral degradation the safeguard of civil dependence, and obtain laws for the protection and improvement of the slave population. Those preliminaries of a qualified and conditional emancipation which are alone compatible with the welfare of the slave and the safety of the community cannot be supplied by any influence but that of Europe. The Confederates must assent to any reasonable conditions in return for the recognition of their independence. No such opportunity for the solution of the great social problem may occur for ages; and to seize the present one is the duty of England above all other countries, because of the political affinity between our system of government and that which it is the aim of the Southern democracy to establish. The Confederates have proved by the spirit of their Con-

stitution the truth of the words which were spoken in the year preceding the Declaration of Independence, by the most enlightened friend of the Americans in Europe: "There is, however, a circumstance," said Burke, speaking of the Southern provinces, "attending these colonies, which, in my opinion, makes the spirit of liberty still more high and haughty than in those to the northward. It is, that in Virginia and the Carolinas they have a vast multitude of slaves. Where this is the case in any part of the world, those who are free are by far the most proud and jealous of their freedom. Freedom to them is not only an enjoyment, but a kind of rank and privilege. Not seeing there that freedom as in countries where it is a common blessing, and as broad and general as the air, may be united with much abject toil, with great misery, with all the exterior of servitude, liberty looks amongst them like something that is more noble and liberal. . . . Such were all the ancient commonwealths, such were our Gothic ancestors, such in our days were the Poles, and such will be all masters of slaves who are not slaves themselves. In such a people the haughtiness of domination combines with the spirit of freedom, fortifies it, and renders it invincible."

---



THE  
HOME AND FOREIGN REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER 1862.

---

PERRAUD ON IRELAND.<sup>1</sup>

IN the years 1835 and 1837 Gustave de Beaumont, the friend and fellow-labourer of Tocqueville, visited Ireland, and made her condition the subject of careful study and analysis. His book perhaps still remains the best which has been given to the world upon that subject. The writer, like his distinguished friend, was a sincere admirer of England and her institutions; and for the faith or nationality of Ireland, though he may have felt, he certainly betrays no peculiar sympathy,—no sympathy that is beyond such as arises from a strong instinct of justice. Reverting to his book after a quarter of a century, it is singular to see how little is really changed; and one can scarcely refrain from a smile in contrasting the predictions of a very thoughtful and discerning man with the measure of their fulfilment. He was attracted to Ireland, he tells us, not merely on account of her sufferings, nor even because her internal condition teemed with moral and political problems of the deepest importance, but for a reason far more calculated to awaken the interest of his countrymen. He thought he saw sure indications that Ireland was about to be the theatre of a spectacle which the world might well turn to witness; that it was the destined field of conflict between the democratic idea and the great aristocracy of England.

Elsewhere over Western Europe democracy had then no

<sup>1</sup> *Etudes sur l'Irlande contemporaine*, par le R. P. Adolphe Perraud, Prêtre de l'Oratoire de l'Immaculée Conception; précédées d'une Lettre de Mgr. l'Evêque d'Orléans. Paris, Douuiol, 2 vols.

battle left to fight, save with the excesses of her own partisans. She held the ground alone amid the shattered fortresses and dying watch-fires of her enemies. Institutions, opinions, manners, laws, had all become, or were fast becoming, her own, informed by her breath, and fashioned anew by her equalising hand. Not only were the passions of the multitude, and the subtler passions of the minority, allied with her, but she exhibited a manifest conformity with modern ideas, and with the scientific and commercial progress of the time, and a force of plain superficial logic which seemed invincible. Against her there seemed only the shadow of a name,—a fond or proud reminiscence; and if in reality there was any thing more substantial, it was a science of human nature too deep to be widely spread. Her problem then as now—then with far more apparent hope than now—was, to replace what she had destroyed. But, as a doctrine and a power, it seemed her plain destiny to go round the world; and the victory over her last antagonist appeared only an affair of time. But of what time? Cross, says M. de Beaumont, a few miles of salt water, and in the country freest of speech and thought, the first in commerce, and among the first in science, democracy is at this day, in the opening of the reign of Queen Victoria, face to face, not with tradition or decrepitude, but with a power in the very fulness of present strength and confidence. That power, indeed, is not unscathed, for only a few years ago some privileges which had degenerated into intolerable abuse were torn away from it. It is not unassailed even now, for both in parliament and the press there is a strong force of theoretical radicalism; and out of doors the discontent of the masses finds a vent in torch-light assemblages, and wild declamation against the nobles and clergy, which sounds like the very echo of our Parisian clubs. Yet, to a reflecting observer, it is plain that in England the heart of the nation is with the aristocracy. Their political power is linked to and springs from their territorial power. They are denounced only where they are unknown; and so long as those whom they govern in direct personal relation—their own tenants and dependents—feel their sway to be just and kindly, so long they may defy the blasts of visionary revolution. Truly, if vice, imbecility, tyranny, ignorance of the genius of their time or nation, be the diseases of which dynasties and aristocracies sicken and die, there is but little sign of the aristocracy of England having forfeited their right to the first place in the empire.

And yet, continues the philosophic politician, it would be an error to imagine that aristocracy in England is so entirely



sound. In England proper it may be so; but cross a few miles more of salt water, and you will behold that institution under very different conditions. You will see an aristocracy hated and earning hatred beyond any foreign example; planted amongst a people with whom they have not one feeling, one memory or hope, in common, and with whom their only relation is that of master and serf. This aristocracy, like its sister and ally, maintains a Church establishment; and that Church establishment, by a legal fiction—*un mensonge légal*—is reputed to be that of the nation, and preys by armed force upon the pittance left to the peasant, as the price of reviling and assailing what the peasant in his inmost heart holds most dear. These are the temporal and spiritual shepherds whom the law has bestowed upon Ireland; and between them they have reduced the bulk of her people to a state of misery and degradation which is a scandal to humanity, and which one who has only seen the peasantry of the Continent can scarcely believe. Here, then, are all the elements of revolution which are wanting in England. And inevitable and swift would the revolution be, if the aristocracy of England did not make common cause with that of Ireland, and sustain it with all its strength. And from this coalition, as from all injustice, danger arises. For if the governing power of England be resolute to maintain in Ireland institutions intolerable in that country, it follows that a whole people are thrown into the democratic ranks, and for their own sake must make common cause with whatever is inimical to aristocracy in England. To what, then, are we to look forward? Will the English be wise enough to abandon this indefensible suburb? All that is truly valuable and excellent in the British constitution may exist without the fellowship of engines of oppression. Will England make this sacrifice to Ireland, and be content to retain within her own shores those institutions to which the genius of her people has given birth, and which suit her so well?

Voluntarily she will not: so much at least may be safely conjectured. In truth, whatever any English statesman may in his own heart desire, the interests and passions opposed to the demands of Ireland are too strong to permit a voluntary concession. What party that is, or could ever hope to be, in power could carry measures of that character? Not the Tories, for it would be in the teeth of the principles by which they exist as a party. Not the Whigs, who are scarcely less aristocratic than the Tories, and who, in any such proposal, would encounter a formidable proportion of their own ranks in addition to the entire Tory opposition. Not the Radicals,

for, besides that the day of their advent to power seems distant indeed, that day could only come through the strength of the English middle class, who, whatever their abstract opinions may be, would be withheld by their powerful anti-Catholic prejudices from applying them in Ireland. Thus we can never hope from England a willing reversal of her Irish policy. It can come only after a long struggle, and in the days of convulsion and fear.

It is sure to come nevertheless. Injustice may live long, but cannot be eternal. Ireland is strong not only in her good cause, but in the means of sustaining it. Seven or eight years ago she extorted from England the most important, the most bitterly contested, of her political rights; and having thus won that power which is in itself no more than a weapon, she will not let it lie idle in the scabbard. The population is now eight millions, close on two-thirds of that of England, and daily approaching towards an equality. She has been trained to political agitation, and is led by a consummate master in that craft, now in the zenith of his popularity, and still, at sixty, in the zenith of his splendid powers. England, entrusted with the command of an immense empire, and having a thousand interests to watch with jealous care, must have her attention perpetually distracted and divided, while that of Ireland is concentrated upon the one object of obtaining justice for herself; for which end, she can avail herself of every opportunity and every ally. The Church establishment, the legal falsehood which infects her whole social existence, and which no statesman dares to defend in point of reason, will be the first institution to fall. Other changes will come. The great privileges attached to land, the system of the grand jurors and of the unpaid magistrates, will all undergo revision. The tenure of land itself will be modified; all legal fetters to its easy circulation in the market will be removed; and gradually a system of peasant proprietorship will spring up. Thus will Ireland put off the aristocratic garments which are now to her like the robe of Nessus, and find her regeneration in the forms of democracy.

And if this be so, will it be without its effect on England? Will the spectacle of a free Church and free land in a country so closely allied to her be without danger to her own institutions, considering all the elements of democracy and dissent which she holds in her own bosom?

*Nescia mens hominum.* A generation of men has come and gone, and these speculations serve only for another example that nothing is certain but the unforeseen. Democracy has indeed in one sense made large strides in England, for the



public opinion of the country has tended more and more to become supreme and irresistible. But for its externals no one cares. The aristocracy, upon the terms of being in the van of the nation, and leading it with ability whither it desires to be led, are cheerfully permitted to hold that place, and are more powerful, more respected, and more deserving of respect, than ever. The five points of Chartism are in the dust. Radicalism in its old form is dried to mummy, and in its new or "philosophic" phase has not yet assumed intelligible lineaments. Speculative changes in the constitution, such as awoke the fiery zeal of thirty years ago, are regarded with icy indifference. Meanwhile the population of England has increased by almost one-half,—fourteen millions have swelled to twenty,—and her commerce and wealth of every kind have been augmented in still greater proportions. Her alliance with France, the only point of danger, has become an integral part of her policy, and is felt to be so rooted in the nature of things, that four successive French governments, each overthrowing its predecessor, and none of them loving England too well, have yet been compelled to adhere to it. And if peril should come, it would come to a people wrought to the very highest pitch of spirit and patriotism, who, at the faintest prospect of attack, sprang to arms spontaneously by tens of thousands. Of course all this may pass away. Some severe crisis of distress among the population, some examples of incapacity in the Government, some unforeseen disaster to the empire, may kindle once more the hidden fires, and rock the foundations of England. But so far the halo of personal popularity which rests upon Queen Victoria is the reflected light of the golden days of her reign.

And what during the same epoch has been the fate of Ireland? When M. de Beaumont visited the country, men supposed that the worst lay behind her, and that her path would henceforth be upwards to the light; little fancying into what new circle of torment she was fated to descend. The observation of Cardinal de Retz, that the wonders of which we have been witnesses strike us incalculably less than those of which we read in history, never came home to any one more than to an Irishman who remembers that he lived through the famine of 1847. It is a history that could be known only in the details; and it never will be known, for the details are such as no one could endure to write or to read. We can follow the ruin and disaster of a gallant army struggling to the last against the rage of men and elements; but who could bear to contemplate the same army sinking helplessly to death in the yielding quicksand? The cruel facts which

constitute the history of Ireland had bestowed upon her a social system "based," as has been said, "upon the potato." The meaning of the phrase is this:—The basis—the point of departure—of the social system in any country is that degree of comfort upon which the peasant is permitted or content to live and breed. Political economy tells us that rent is the surplus produced by the better soils over the worst which will repay cultivation; whence it follows, that the productive power of that worst soil defines the scale of living of the peasant, and is the measure of all that society appropriates to other purposes. In Ireland, the people, despoiled and powerless, were driven to the extreme verge of human subsistence: their standard of living became fixed at a precarious meal of a perishable root; every thing else, all the rich produce of grain and cattle with which the island teemed, being *surplus*. When, then, an unforeseen visitation passed over every country in Europe, it brought scarcity and pressure to other lands; to Ireland, utter ruin. The surplus—the grain and cattle—went their accustomed way, and the people lay down to die. Famine, fever, dysentery, and the despairing rush of the survivors to some land where they might find life, made sad havoc of the eight millions. In ten years, upwards of two hundred and eighty thousand houses disappeared; the fires upon two hundred and eighty thousand hearths, each one in its way a little centre of home affections, were quenched; and the census of last year shows that the population has been brought down to five millions and three-quarters. Such an extent of disaster in such a period is without precedent in any history of which we have record. Perhaps what came home most sadly to Irish feelings was the emigration, even when reason concluded that it was for the best. At every port, at every railway station, the emigrants were seen in crowds; young men and women, who were the very strength and flower of the country, and whom any country should be proud to retain and nourish in its bosom,—there they were, taking their last leave of those who could not follow them, with wild cries and all the vehemence of a sensitive and demonstrative race. Those who witnessed them could not help feeling something of the same rending of the heart as themselves, and looking back to the long train of confiscation and oppression on the great scale and the small, of which all this misery in the middle of the nineteenth century was but the fruit and outcome:

"E se non piangi di che pianger suoli?"

With the destruction of the population of Ireland has come that of her political power. Of all the objects contemplated



by M. de Beaumont, not one has been achieved. The Church establishment stands apparently more firm than ever. Since M. de Beaumont wrote, the change was effected which transmuted tithe into tithe rent-charge, abolishing at once the vexatious incidents of collection, and placing the support of the Church upon a basis which would be amongst the fairest and least onerous of state provisions, provided the Church were in reality the Church of the people. But the real and essential grievance is, that a theory in the teeth of fact—the theory that Ireland is a Protestant country, and should be dealt with as such—is imposed by law, and runs through all the details of government. This grievance, the parent of more practical evil than any one who is not conversant with Ireland can imagine, has undergone no mitigation whatsoever since the date of M. de Beaumont's book. The Irish representative in Parliament has sunk from a power into a nonentity, waging "a dreary, hopeless, desultory war;" and the minds of the people, sickened of long failures, return a languid and desponding echo to all political incitements. They see no possibility of success where O'Connell and many able men succeeding him have, one after the other, attempted and failed. *Quod non Tydides, non Larissæus Achilles*. This apathy would be wholesome if it sprang from political content, not, as in fact it does, from political despair. For truth obliges us to add, that beneath all this there is a spirit of disaffection to Government more general and profound than has existed for at least fifty years—a disaffection, too, which threatens to escape from its last rein, the influence of the priesthood. Of the more dismal feature which has of late so shocked and startled men,—the resurrection of the demon of agrarian crime,—and of the lurid light thus thrown upon the social relations of Ireland, we are not now about to speak.

The picture has, however, its fairer side. Beyond question the material condition of the people is improved; the social system has no longer the potato for its sole basis, and we see no reason to fear that it will ever again sink so low. The population are, no doubt, still very miserable as compared with that of any other portion of Western Europe, and in many parts of the country their existence may still be imperilled by a bad season; but they are, on the whole, better fed, better clothed, and better lodged than formerly. Education—thanks to the national system, one of the greatest blessings ever bestowed upon any country—has become almost universal. Crime, making every allowance for late atrocities, has, upon the whole, enormously diminished, and general habits of lawlessness even more so. And Father Mathew's movement, al-

though as teetotalism it has almost died out, has left a large residuum of its effects in the popular sentiment. Drunkenness is regarded as a disgrace, not a thing to glory in, and certainly could not now be deemed a characteristic vice of the country. These are great gains. The clearance effected by the Encumbered Estates Court is another. The sluttish and thriftless management of land under insolvent proprietors, or that terrible bailiff of insolvent proprietors, the Court of Chancery, is no longer a prominent feature of Irish society. On the whole, the outward and visible aspects of the country are manifestly changed for the better. We should be heartily glad to be able to tell the same story as to its internal relations, moral and political.

The main evils of Ireland may be ranked under three heads, which indeed are at bottom one. They are, first, the divided political interests of its population; secondly, which is the fruit of the first, the total want on the part of Ireland as a country of her due political power,—we do not say in the concerns of the empire, a height to which she has in truth never aspired, but in the management of her own insular affairs; and thirdly, that worst of all evils, the almost social war which exists between classes bound to mutual affection and dependence.

We say, the divided political interests of the population, not the division of creed or race. As to difference of races, we do not at all deny to each of the great stirpes of the human family its peculiar characteristics; but any attempt to explain political sentiments and actions in Ireland by the distinction of Celtic or Saxon blood, instead of by the actual circumstances and living interests which really rule men, would be utterly futile. The truth is, that a great deal of the most Irish part of Ireland in point of feeling has a large mixture of Saxon blood, and that full half at least of the most famous amongst Irish rebels were English by descent. Difference of religion seems a more inevitable root of disunion, and yet only seems so. It is not so in other countries; for example, Hungary. It is not so in Ireland itself, if we look into the matter. Irish Catholics have never manifested the slightest objection to unite with, or be led by, Protestants whose political opinions agreed with their own. They are rather disposed, if any thing, to give a preference to Protestants over Catholics. Quite true, say their antagonists, they have no objection to a Protestant, if he does their work and is a traitor to the Protestant cause. In that phrase lies the key to the whole mischief. There is then a Protestant cause, a Protestant interest, dearer to its supporters than



any common ground upon which they could unite with Catholics. And that Protestant cause is simply the maintenance of the present state fiction which classes and treats Ireland as a Protestant country. There is hardly a branch of legislation into which this original principle of division does not subtly insinuate itself, as any one who watches the course of Irish affairs in Parliament during any single session may bear witness. In fact, the Protestants of Ireland, wedded to a position which in their hearts they feel to be untenable, are guided by the most unhappy of all policies—a policy of fear.

The gentry of Ireland are its natural political leaders; and it is a false and abnormal state of things which deprives them of that leadership. They will regain it on the day, but never until the day, when the theory of the State in Ireland as regards religion is made to correspond with the fact, and when, by the establishment of perfect religious equality, no question is left upon which Protestants as Protestants, and Catholics as Catholics, must be driven into opposite ranks. And upon the same day Ireland as a country will begin to acquire naturally and easily (not merely in the spasm of agitation as heretofore) that might and power of which she is now almost totally deprived.

These reflections have occurred to us very forcibly in reading the work of Father Perraud, who has devoted himself laboriously and conscientiously to the study of the present condition of Ireland. It is surprising that a stranger could succeed in acquiring information so extended and minute. His book travels over all the salient features in the condition of the country—the appointments and employments, the jury system, education, poor-laws, the question of land, and the great question of the Church establishment. On all these subjects he has gone through an amount of statistics and blue-books enough to appal many who have more personal interest in their contents. Apparently, there was no means of obtaining information open to him that he neglected. It happens to him, of course, as to any one who learns a country chiefly from books, or from observations necessarily imperfect, that many matters are not seen precisely as they are, and results are sometimes ascribed to wrong, or at least partial, causes. A stranger, too, has great difficulty in estimating the true value of the testimonies which are given to him. Father Perraud was evidently aware of these difficulties in his path, and he has endeavoured, as far as possible, to contend against them. One other fault has been found with him. It is said that his book is written too exclusively in a clerical spirit and from a clerical point of view. Now, un-

doubtedly, Father Perraud is a priest, and a zealous one, and as such he must be taken. It is no fault in a book that it reflects what lies in the heart of the writer; and a book about Ireland by a Catholic priest is likely to be Catholic in its colouring.

His work is arranged under the several divisions in which the state of Ireland may be regarded: her condition as regards political equality, the tenure of land, and the land-system generally; industry and commerce; emigration; the state of the poor; poor-laws; public education; and lastly, the religious question.

Under the head of political equality the author considers how far the actual working of the Emancipation Act has fallen short of its true spirit, and the position of relative inferiority in which Catholics are still placed as regards their enjoyment of public functions. The Emancipation Act reserved a small number of offices from which Catholics were to be excluded,—absurdly enough, as it appears to any modern Frenchman; but of the important offices thrown open to them how many are they permitted substantially to enjoy?

“What may be termed the general rule, and one which suffers few exceptions, is, that the principal functions in each order are held by Protestants, often even by Englishmen, and that Irish Catholics are confined to subaltern places. Let us be permitted, in justification of these assertions, to take a rapid review of the different classes of the functionaries of Government in Ireland.

The head of the Inland Revenue department is an Englishman and a Protestant. All the *employés* of the upper grade are Protestants.

The Controller-General of Stamp Duties is an Englishman and a Protestant.

The Superintendent-General of Income-tax is an Englishman and a Protestant.

The superior officers of the Coast-Guard are almost all English and Protestant.

The Chief-Treasurer of the Civil Services is an Englishman and a Protestant.

The Board of Inspectors of Manufactures has its seat in London. The two Sub-Inspectors, residing in Ireland, are Protestant.

The four Directors of Government Agency for Emigration are Protestants, although the greater part of the emigrants are Irish Catholics.

The Committee of the Loan Fund is composed of thirty-eight members, of whom twenty-eight are Protestants.

The Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests return six Catholics and seven Protestants.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> We give the extracts from Father Perraud exactly. In the case, however, of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests it cannot be said



The Superintendent-General of Statistics of Agriculture and Emigration is Protestant.

The administration of Public Works is confided to three Commissioners, all Protestants—a Welshman, an Englishman, and an Irishman. The Secretary, the Assistant, and the Controllers are English and Protestants.”

Of the police he gives a table, taken from Sir Henry Brownrigg's report to Parliament in 1860, which shows that in the higher situations Protestants have an enormous preponderance. The inspector-general and deputy inspector-general, two out of the three assistant inspectors-general, 32 out of 35 county inspectors, 204 out of 269 sub-inspectors, are Protestants. Amongst the privates, Catholics are to Protestants very nearly as three to one.

“In the administration of the Poor-Laws there are five Commissioners, of whom three receive salaries. The whole five are Protestants, and four are English.

Nine out of thirteen Inspectors of Poor-Laws are Protestants. The upper clerks are nearly all Protestants.

No one Chief-Secretary of Ireland has ever been a Catholic.

Of ten Under-Secretaries, since Emancipation, one alone (Sir T. Redington) has been a Catholic; and for some years back that office has been held by an English Protestant.

Of twenty-one Attorneys-general, since 1829, eight alone were Catholics; of twenty-six Solicitors-general, nine were Catholics, and the remaining seventeen Protestants. A proportional equality only begins in the composition of the four superior courts of justice, since seven of the twelve Judges are Catholics.”

There are now eight Catholic common-law judges out of twelve. The number of Catholics upon the bench is undoubtedly a testimony that the Emancipation Act has not been a dead letter. The fact itself, however, in no way arises from any exceptional liberality as regards legal appointments, but simply from party methods and exigencies. All the distinguished Catholics at the bar for many years were adherents of the Liberal Government, and many of them became members of Parliament. On the other hand, the Whigs counted but few Protestants among their adherents; although of late the long spell of power which they have enjoyed has had its inevitable effect in attracting into their ranks numbers of their former antagonists. Now since government by party is carried on

there is any unfairness. The relative numbers are fixed by Act of Parliament. Five of the members of the Board must be Catholics, five Protestants; with the Master of the Rolls, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Judge of the Prerogative Court as *ex officio* members.

by the promotion of partisans, the Whig Government had no choice but to promote their Catholic adherents, who accordingly, stepping from grade to grade, have found themselves the majority on the common-law bench. No doubt it is an immense good, in its way, that the Emancipation Act has thus enabled Catholics to take advantage of the necessities of party. And in subordinate matters the same working of a free government has produced analogous results. For as the county member, in return for his votes, is always allowed a potent voice in county appointments, and as county influences exercise a control just as potent upon the member, a great many of the smaller situations throughout the country have fallen to Catholics. This system in general, which of course applies to England as well as Ireland, is sometimes denounced as corruption; but on the whole it works, to say the least, as well as any other which could be proposed. Of late, the course of Catholic politics in Ireland has tended almost wholly to deprive Catholics of these advantages,—with what compensating result, it is extremely hard to say. But there are other classes of appointments where the choice neither depends, as in the higher legal appointments, on the combined professional position and political claims of the individual, nor lies within the customary patronage of any member of Parliament. Such are the higher appointments in the Revenue department, the Poor-Law Board, and the various Government departments specified by Father Perraud; and in them, it is the simple truth to say, there has been nothing like an attempt to put Catholics on an equality with Protestants. It is an unquestionable fact, which no one familiar with Ireland will deny, that wherever the action of Government is not overridden by political influences, that action, even where Government is deemed most liberal, is decidedly and almost exclusively Protestant.

Now, in answer to all this, it is asked, and very forcibly, what else can in reason be expected? If Protestants in Ireland be numerically a minority, still in wealth, position, education, fitness for office, they are the large majority; and the result complained of arises, not from the exclusion of Catholics as Catholics, but because that class which in any country attains high office happens in Ireland to be mainly composed of Protestants. The reply to this is, that, much as it may be desired that religion were a matter of perfect indifference in civil appointments, so as the man were fit for his post, yet in Ireland the dawning of the day when it will be so seems distant, nor can it come while religion is a wall of separation in political interests. We have, then, a population to govern, of whom three-fourths are Catholics. We



may or may not desire to govern them upon the principle of producing confidence and content ; but if we do, we must let them see that their faith and feelings are represented in those upper walks of government where power really resides.

To the administration of justice in its more exalted departments Father Perraud bears the highest testimony. As a general rule, nothing can be more admirable or equitable. Of the criminal jurisprudence especially we will say that, if it has a fault, it errs on the side of leniency. The criminal procedure of the English law is the fairest and most indulgent on earth, and its leniency is even greater in Ireland than in England. The great principle of "the benefit of the doubt" never has been accorded to a prisoner with such latitude as in Ireland, and the constitutional rights of the accused are most zealously guarded and asserted. Cases occur at almost every assizes, of trials in Ireland ending in acquittal, where in England there would be a moral certainty of conviction ; and convictions are constantly obtained in England upon evidence which to an Irish jury would not seem free from such doubt as the prisoner should have the benefit of. And this takes place in cases wholly free from any sectarian colour. We do not say which method, on the whole, works best. Juries in both countries act in the main according to their consciences, guided by the direction of the judge.<sup>3</sup>

The whole machinery of justice in the superior courts in Ireland, and in cases into which no peculiar passion enters, works as well as in any country ; and those who, confining their view to some party cases, have declared trial by jury unsuited to Ireland have judged very hastily. In fact, not only does trial by jury work well, but its beneficial effects upon the intelligence of the community, and their political education, is incalculable. The juries come from the ends of the county without a murmur to discharge their gratuitous and onerous

<sup>3</sup> There is one case which apparently seems to be opposed to what is here said of the merciful tendencies of Irish juries. We refer to the conviction of Kirwan, some years ago, in Dublin, for the murder of his wife at Ireland's Eye ; a conviction which was universally denounced by the English press as unjustifiably rash. The truth is, no verdict was ever come to on more sufficient grounds, as was demonstrated by a most able letter from the foreman of the jury, written after the sentence was commuted. But the prisoner, being a man of position and influence, succeeded in enlisting the press in his favour ; and a cry was raised against Irish precipitancy, which frightened the Government into sparing his life. And a man who, *if guilty*, was guilty of a murder equalling in atrocity any upon record, and *if innocent*, or if not proved to be guilty, should have been at once set free, was, by a strange application of the doctrine of chances, saved from death by Government, but transported for life. Of his guilt no mortal now entertains a doubt ; and the evidence was much more home than in Palmer's case, or that of Miss Hall's murderer.

duty, not merely through fear of penalties, but with a complete sense of the constitutional importance of their function, and of the necessity of undergoing this labour for their own good as well as that of others. Their conclusions are in the main right, just as in the main they are in England; and if there are somewhat more disagreements than with us, there are fewer stupid or perverse verdicts.

We have spoken hitherto of ordinary cases between man and man, or between the Crown and the accused. There is, however, a class of cases open to other reflections,—those which arouse political or religious passions. From these cases arises the controversy as to the merits of jury-packing.

That juries have been packed in Ireland, and that the practice is by no means obsolete, no one can for a moment deny. That is to say, jury-panels are so arranged by sheriffs, and the right of setting aside jurors so exercised by the Crown, that the entire jury is composed of men on whom it is conceived that reliance may be placed. This was the case all through the state trials of 1848, and again a few years ago in the Catholic county of Kerry, where to try Catholic prisoners for an offence against the State an exclusively Protestant jury was empanelled. The practice, as we said, is not denied, but it is defended, and defended on the following grounds. If, it is said, the Crown has to be careful as to the composition of juries for the trial of political cases, it is not that injustice to the prisoner may be done, but that gross injustice to the public may be prevented. Experience has shown that in cases of the plainest guilt, juries as they are ordinarily composed in Ireland will not in political cases find verdicts for the Crown; and if government is to be carried on at all, it is indispensable that those whose disregard of their duties as jurors would paralyse the whole action of the State should not be placed in a position to exercise that unjust power. This reasoning would lead those who use it much further than they conceive, and leaves out of account a peculiarity, and a most beneficial one, which distinguishes juries from all other tribunals.

The special excellence of juries consists in this, that they represent the common sense and common feeling of the community. In ordinary cases, their decisions are no inadequate measure of that human and natural mode of judging which emancipates itself from those technical fetters that bind even the clearest minds among the professionally educated. It is really, and not in a formula alone, “the country” which speaks through the mouth of twelve men. Now this same representation of the feeling of the community exists of necessity



in political cases also. It is utterly in vain, if it were a thousand times repeated, to bid juries act in total disregard of the impressions received outside the box. It is hopeless to expect from a jury that "dry light" of the reason, superior to all sympathy and all antipathy, which hardly the bench of judges itself will furnish. Where a country is united in feeling, as in England, an unpopular political trial has not the slightest chance of success, whatever be the evidence. Look at the result of Pitt's prosecutions. Or take again the trial of Dr. Bernard a few years ago for complicity in Orsini's conspiracy. Of course we are not about to impugn the verdict; but does any mortal believe that that verdict was uninfluenced by the strong feeling, out of doors, that the English Government was too subservient to the Emperor of the French, or by the political clap-traps, quite independent of the merits of the case, which the counsel for the accused rang in the ears of the jury? In this way juries in England have always been felt to discharge a very important political office, operating as a check upon Government when it runs in an unpopular direction. What takes place in Ireland is the same, with this difference, that the country being divided against itself, there are unhappily two publics, two public opinions, and a double way of regarding every political transaction. In political trials there is constantly a party to approve, and a party to condemn, the prosecution. If, therefore, political trials in Ireland become abortive through disagreements of the jury, it is no more than a symptom of the discontent of a portion of the population; and to deal with it by forming exclusive juries only deepens the discontent. It would in all ways be incomparably wiser for Government to submit for the present to defeat, and to look to the action of time and justice to bring about that general feeling of the community which, in all well-governed countries, makes men resent and revolt from treason as an assault upon their own well-being.

In a work small in size, but of importance far beyond its size, and beyond possibly the conception of the writer, the Professor of Modern History at Oxford has endeavoured, as he says, to induce those on either side who deal with the subject of Ireland to cultivate "the charities of history;" by which, we suppose, he does not mean any sentimental sophistication in treating of acts of villany or dishonour, but that charity which is the child of insight, and which endeavours, in judging of the actions of past generations, to see with their eyes and move in their element,—a charity which, like humility, pleases because it is truth. Of this charitable view there is on both sides of Irish affairs large need, and on both sides

unfortunately far too great a lack. Any work upon Ireland written by an Englishman in a spirit, we do not say of sympathy and kindness, but of the commonest fairness, has better effects than an indifferent person would imagine. If we were asked what had done most mischief to the relations between England and Ireland during the last dozen years, we should answer, without a moment's hesitation, the habitual tone of the English press. With some honourable exceptions, to which all praise is due, the organs of public opinion in this country, high and low, hardly ever approach the subject of Irish affairs except in a strain of contumely. It is in the very blood of the Celtic race to be peculiarly sensitive to verbal insult; and we could point to many instances of men strongly attracted towards England, and attracted perhaps the more by their contempt for anti-English declamation, having that feeling wholly reversed, and changed into little less than utter hatred, by reading our daily journals. Of course Ireland, on her side, is far from guiltless in the same kind. There is a great deal of wild and unreasonable abuse of England in Irish newspapers, and there is especially a tendency to grope in the dirt of English criminal annals for scandals to fling in our face. But the English are in this matter the foremost, and by much the most pernicious offenders. The invective of the weak against the strong it is natural for the strong to disregard, and sometimes even to enjoy; but the insolence of the strong towards the weak is a very different thing, and begets very different results. The fact is one which has not escaped Continental observers, even the most ardent admirers of England. "The tone of the English towards Ireland," says M. Jules de Lasteyrie, in a passage cited by Father Perraud, "is always detestable;" and M. Emile Montégut, in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, written some years ago, declares that one sentence such as is habitual in the English press on the subject of Ireland would be sufficient to set two nations by the throat in the most deadly conflict. Now it is but showing the other side of the same disposition, to say that the Irish are very open to be affected by cordiality of language. Often as they have heard that soft words butter no parsneps, the soft words have their inevitable charm; and still more if they arise out of a manly discernment of what is just.

Ireland, we have said, is discontented, because she has not the political weight which her importance demands. This defect has sprung from the terms upon which the union with England was accomplished. It is an observation, we think, of Chief-Justice Bushe, that, conceding that union in some form



must sooner or later have been effected, it came too soon. He believed that Ireland had within herself the means of working out those remedies for her evils which her immediate subjection to the will of the English people impeded and retarded. The observation is full of wisdom. The turning-point, in fact, of later Irish history is the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam in 1795. We do not desire to go deeply into the past; but the circumstances of that transaction are so pregnant with instruction that we must briefly advert to them. In the beginning of 1795, the perils which were closing round the empire prompted the English ministry to send a message of peace to Ireland. Upon this ground Pitt and the Duke of Portland met Grattan, and it was arranged that Lord Fitzwilliam should go to Ireland, authorised to sanction the carrying of Catholic Emancipation. Burke, then broken by his domestic calamity, took a considerable part in the negotiation; and his letters show how much his heart, though crushed, was still sensible to the hope that the growing spirit of Jacobinism in Ireland might at last be exorcised by justice. Lord Fitzwilliam arrived amidst the universal joy of the population; the largest supplies ever voted by Ireland were given for carrying on the war; and, shortly after, Grattan moved for leave to bring in a bill for the relief of the Roman Catholics. Then was seen the measure of the intrinsic strength of that faction upon whom it has become the fashion to cast all the sins of Downing Street. In truth, they never had any strength but as the instruments of the English minister, and they knew it. The real Protestant opinion of Ireland was then *with* the Catholics, and strongly desirous of a settlement which would permit them to enjoy their common country in peace. The petitions for the measure were innumerable from Protestants and Catholics alike; those against it miserably few, and chiefly from the old corporate bodies. And when Grattan moved for leave to bring in that bill the carrying of which in 1829 almost cost an insurrection, the dissentients in the House of Commons were precisely three. If Catholic Emancipation had then passed, and been followed by bringing men like Grattan and George Knox into the Irish administration, there is no doubt that the country would have been pacified. The Catholics, almost to a man, would have adhered to Government; and although there would have remained (as in England) some fanatical republicans, they would have been numerically incapable of mischief. Time would certainly have brought other healing measures. Chief-Justice Bushe remarked to George IV., while in Ireland, that the idea of Protestantism as the ex-

clusive religion of the State never took root in Ireland to the same extent as in England, and that it would have been not at all a startling thing to see Catholic and Protestant bishops sitting side by side in the House of Lords. And to this hour, notwithstanding all that is said to the contrary, there is no such intolerance amongst the body of Irish Protestants as exists in England. In Ireland, Protestants and Catholics are too often antagonists, and even enemies, bitter enough; but they meet, so to speak, upon the same platform, have their political struggles,—their ups and downs,—and are forced, by the nature of the case, to recognise what is before their eyes, that both religions are real and vital elements which must assert themselves in the country: while in England, whatever be the general fairness of character, Popery is regarded as a foreign element, and its admixture in the constitution and government is felt as odious. Undoubtedly, the Irish Parliament and people would have accomplished a settlement of Irish complications, if they had been allowed; but they were not. The Cookes and Beresfords, powerless at home, were unhappily too powerful elsewhere,—in the closet and at the ear of the king and his minister. Pitt, having obtained from Ireland her largest supplies of money and men, disavowed and recalled Lord Fitzwilliam; and the best hope that ever existed of really pacifying Ireland and binding her to the empire came to an end. It is striking to read the exclamations of Burke, and his expressions of self-reproach that he was made a party, however innocently, to so cruel a deception. "Guess," he says, in a letter to Grattan (3 March 1795), "at my shame and humiliation, when I find myself the innocent means of putting you in danger of losing the whole of the importance by which you were enabled to do these things, and by which you would be enabled to continue them until the very idea of Jacobinism was eradicated from this part of the empire. I beg your pardon a thousand times, if I have been the means of the triumph of the intrigues in Ireland over your manly virtues . . . . The malignant part of the opposition, who predicted this very thing, and whose joy upon it knows no bounds, judged better by the event than I did. I am lost and confounded; I have humbly submitted my sentiments; I have nothing but to take refuge in oblivion, until I take refuge in the grave." And in a subsequent letter: "Things are in a most unpleasant way, and must remain so whilst a certain family cabal are in the sole possession of the ear of Government, as long as it is believed that they, and they alone, are faithfully attached to the interests of the



Crown, and the only proper representatives of *English* government."<sup>4</sup>

The position of a man like Edmund Burke in such a time, and among such men, was a spectacle to witness. Devoted heart and soul to England; kindling his dying energies into their brightest flame, that he might rouse her to do battle against the armed atheism which threatened her existence; he implored those in whose hands the destinies of England were placed to purchase, at the cheap price of a little justice, the hearts of those who were their natural, and would have been their cordial, allies in that warfare—the Catholic people and clergy of Ireland. And he was answered by the renewal of a persecution which threw the Catholics of Ireland into the arms of France, and brought the empire within a hair's-breadth of ruin. It requires much of the charity of history to forgive Pitt his grievous error in this affair of Lord Fitzwilliam. Even in point of judgment, what are we to think of the statesmanship which listened to Cooke and Beresford rather than to Burke and Grattan?

Lord Camden succeeded Lord Fitzwilliam; and the well-known policy was inaugurated. When it had borne its fruit, when Ireland lay soaked in blood, and heavy with the tread of two hundred thousand soldiers, the marriage treaty was broached.

— “paribus se legibus ambæ  
Invictæ gentes æterna in fœdera mittant,”

said Pitt: but his agents and advisers mocked his patriotic hopes; and King George III. dismissed him rather than adopt the measure which alone could justify and cement the Union.

The immediate consequence was, to subject the affairs of Ireland to the control of a blind mass of prejudice and ignorance. Englishmen might love and thoroughly understand their own country, but it was not extraordinary that they should not exhibit a spectacle never yet seen on earth,—one people comprehending or caring for another. An empire which is composed of a mass of heterogeneous elements, and which yet acknowledges the duties and maintains the rights of freedom, cannot do justice to these two conditions of its existence, except by developing the system of self-government to its highest perfection; giving to each part, as far as possible, the regulation of its own internal interests; establishing a rigorous equality in justice; abolishing all the remnants and traditions of conquest, and all causes of dis-

<sup>4</sup> Burke to Grattan, 3 March 1795, and 5 March 1795,—Grattan's Life, by his Son, iv. 199-202.

content; and, so, removing every thing that would tend to make self-government the predominance of a faction, or to put the interest of a party into antagonism with the interests of the State. This has been discovered and acted upon of late years with priceless results in the case of the colonies. In the case of Scotland, though that country is beyond comparison more homogeneous with England than Ireland is, government would be impossible but for the wise system which has been adopted, of leaving the Scotch representatives really omnipotent in purely Scottish matters which are distinct from imperial questions. What would be the fate of any attempt to legislate for Scotland *ab extra* was shown some five-and-thirty years ago, when an innovation was attempted in the old Scottish system of banking, and the growl of Malachy Malagrowth forced the Government very speedily to draw out of the hot water into which they had incautiously plunged. Some similar relegation of Irish government to Irishmen would no doubt have taken place, even since the Union, if that measure had not been accomplished on the unhappy basis of religious ascendancy. This acted fatally in two ways. First, it produced a rent or chasm in the Irish representation, dividing it from end to end, and preventing any real combination of Irish power upon the questions most vital to the country. And secondly, it brought the religious passions of England to bear directly upon the government of Ireland. These passions resisted emancipation for a generation. These passions retain the Church establishment, for which reason has no word to say. How effective in their operation they still are, we may see without looking far for an example. Father Perraud, in his observations upon the Emancipation Act, dwells to some extent upon the exceptions made in that Act, not as being generally very oppressive in themselves, but as mutilations of the principle of religious freedom. In the true spirit of a modern Frenchman, to whom religious distinctions in matters of politics seem to belong wholly to the past, he calls the government which retains them *un gouvernement d'ancien régime*. But there is one especially of these restrictions which is not merely absurd, but a real grievance. No Catholic can be Lord Chancellor of Ireland. This exclusion is not even called for upon any principle of the symmetry of injustice, as connected with the maintenance of the Established Church; for the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has no church patronage. Some of the greatest equity lawyers whom Ireland has produced have been Catholics, and Catholics who have won their way to the common-law bench. But the first place in their profession is denied to them. Two



years ago a bill was brought in by Sir William Somerville to sweep away this one item of unfairness ; but the Government grew afraid, lest the Protestant feelings of England should be aroused, and the bill was withdrawn. This was an experiment which was made and failed. How many kindred experiments in the direction of justice remain unattempted owing to a dread of the same obstacle !

To contend against this heavy body of resistance offered by the No-Popery spirit of England, an opposing force had to be developed in Ireland ; and thus a power was created which no reflecting man of either country can contemplate without serious thoughts for the future. We mean the political power of the Catholic priesthood ; a power which one of the most respected of the Catholic hierarchy upon a late occasion defended as a necessary evil in the circumstances of Ireland, but which, even in defending it, he deplored. If Catholic Emancipation had passed in 1795, or even in 1801, that power would never have grown up. Before the Union, and for many years after it, the Catholic clergy were a singularly quiet body of men, averse from tumult, opposed to democratic principles, and always disposed to side with Government, if Government would give them a chance by the least shadow of good treatment. It was O'Connell who, having an enormous work to do in the face of enormous obstacles, discerned all the resources that lay in the latent strength of a body so organised, so homogeneous, and so influential with the people. He used the clergy with consummate skill, and imbued them with a sense of their power and a taste for its exercise, which time has matured and fortified. Upon the whole, their political influence has hitherto worked beneficially. As between the landlord on the one hand, who coerces the peasant to vote against his conscience, and the priest on the other, who appeals to his conscience against that coercion, beyond question it is the priest who is on the side of the moral elevation and dignity of his people. And this remains true when every concession has been made as to grievous mistakes of judgment, and coarse and often indefensible acts and words. But it is a condition of things pregnant with ultimate danger. Clergymen are, of course, entitled to their part in politics as subjects ; and some churchmen, as we know, have been in the foremost rank of statesmen ; but, on the whole, the clerical point of view, from which it is the general tendency of the clergy to regard civil affairs, is calculated to act mischievously both on politics and religion. When the Catholic priesthood of Ireland say that the people have been deserted by the aristocracy, their natural leaders,

who are found in the ranks of their enemies, and that, if they, the clergy, have stepped into their place, it is because there was none else to do so, they say what is unhappily too true; but it gives us only a keener longing to see that fiction which lies at the root of the divisions and weaknesses of Ireland extinguished, so that the elements in that country may settle into their natural order, and the people follow in lay affairs their natural lay leaders, Catholic or Protestant.

In extinguishing that fiction lies the difficulty and labour; for apparently the question is more backward now than it was a quarter of a century ago. Yet the backwardness is only apparent, and is an instance of that law of oscillation which governs all political questions. The same might have been said of the questions of Catholic emancipation or reform in 1820 as compared with 1790. In the opinion of thinking and influential men, the Church establishment of Ireland has been becoming more and more condemned; and such testimonies as those of Mr. Goldwin Smith, in his recent book on Ireland, and such expressions as Lord Stanley lately used, are the proof of it. Upon that ground, the alliance between the Irish Catholics and the genuine liberal party to whom the future government of England belongs, must be based. The Irish have been blamed for their proverb, that England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity; but with their experience, it needs a greater amount of political wisdom than they possess to make them think otherwise. "I remember," says Wilberforce, in one of his letters, "when some years before 1782 the slightest concession to Ireland was contemptuously refused; and I remember afterwards, when far more than was ever dreamed of was yielded in a panic, and to every objection the answer was, 'Hush, they have eighty thousand men in arms!'" And the concessions of 1793, and above all those of 1829, which Sir Robert Peel has elaborately shown were only granted to the peril of civil war, tell far too eloquently the same story.

After all, it may be asked, what has England to gain by thus satisfying Ireland? Does she not find her account in the present system, which leaves Ireland divided and powerless, to be dealt with at her pleasure? To that at least an answer can be given.

The present system no doubt renders England politically stronger as between her and Ireland, but it makes her imperially weaker as between her and the world. Nine or ten years after the Union, Sydney Smith said of the mass of the people of Ireland, that in case of an invasion "they would rise upon you to a man." And the Duke of Wellington, at about the



same time, declared, that in case of an invasion, Ireland must be treated as an enemy's country. In such a contingency, the Protestants would of course be on the side of England; but in three provinces their numbers are too few to tell. The Catholics of the upper and higher middle-class, who have tasted the fruits of Emancipation, and who thoroughly appreciate the excellence of the constitution, would be on the same side. The artisans and tradesmen, on the other hand, who are but little under the control of the priesthood, and are full of theoretical democracy, are for the most part profoundly disaffected, and to the extent of their power would be ardently on the side of the invaders. But they would not have much in their power. The real issue would lie with the agrarian peasantry and the clergy. Neither of these classes has been smiled on by the Government under which they live, and they feel that they owe it little love. The priests would, however, be restrained by their religious principles and their dislike of bloodshed, and would probably exhort their flocks to remain neutral. Owing to these exhortations, and to the natural stolidity and caution of the peasantry, there would be no spontaneous movement on their part; but the invaders would find themselves surrounded by all the advantages of a friendly country, supplied with provisions and information, and, after a time, with recruits—the material for first-rate soldiers. And if they had any striking success in the beginning, and especially if they succeeded in occupying Dublin, and forming something like a government, the adhesion of the great majority of the island to their cause would be a matter of almost certainty.

A different system would make Ireland, on the contrary, one of the strongest bulwarks against invasion from abroad. There is no inherent disposition to disloyalty in the Irish race. The fact is quite the other way. Where, as in Canada, they experience that the government is in truth a government for them as well as others, and have the daily sense of that fact, no people are more prone to an enthusiastic adherence to their rulers. The case of Canada might be made the case of Ireland by measures conceived in the wise spirit which has presided over our Canadian legislation,—by a final abolition of the religious ascendancy both name and thing, and the consequent growth of that self-government which alone can challenge or secure the loyalty of the Irish people.

## POOR-RELIEF IN ENGLAND AND FRANCE.

[COMMUNICATED.]

THE older the world grows, the more universally true it will be found that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." A man cannot estimate the degree of liberty which the citizens of any state enjoy by simply reading their written constitution, however solemnly it may have been set up, or however unanimously it may have been voted. He must first learn how it is carried out in practice. In the same way, it would be impossible to get an exact picture of the condition of a country out of tables of statistics. The attempt would be simply presumptuous. A man must have learned how to construe the figures before he can use them without blundering. So, again, no study of statute-books, *bulletins des lois*, codes, and regulations, will make a man understand the real course of business and the practical administration of affairs. Such an idea would be a mere illusion; between written and applied law there is the same difference as between a statue and a living man.

A good illustration of this truth may be found in a comparison between the English poor-law and the legislation on *bienfaisance* in France. If we look only to the letter of the law, no two things can seem more alike than the English and French systems. By the English law, every poor person may claim the right of maintenance by his parish. The French law of March 19, 1793, gives the same right to the French poor. If the date of this law makes my readers suspect that it is a part of the revolutionary legislation which passed away with the Revolution, the following extract from a ministerial circular of the 8th February 1823 will show that it was still in vigour at that day: "All unfortunate persons have a right to assistance every time that the force of circumstances makes it impossible for them to provide themselves with the necessities of life. It is, then, these cases of necessity which the *bureaux de bienfaisance* have to inquire into; for as we ought readily to aid a person in real distress, so ought we to avoid that indiscriminate almsgiving which only increases idleness, debauchery, and the other vices which inevitably lead to destitution."

Here, then, the right to relief is given to every indigent person. But to whom does the duty of maintaining him belong? In England it is to the parish, in France to the commune.<sup>1</sup> The board of guardians answers to the *bureau de*

<sup>1</sup> Law of the 24th Vendémiaire an II.



*bienfaisance*, as I shall show further on. Again, that which in England is called *settlement*, is called in France *domicile de secours*, and is determined by the law of the 24th Vendémiaire an II, which provides that the domicile shall be acquired by birth, by residence during one year, by sudden attacks of sickness, or by accidents, and in some other cases which do not much differ from the English regulations. Finally, on one side of the Channel we have workhouses; on the other, the *dépôts de mendicité*, with their compulsory labour, and the *ateliers de charité*, or charitable workshops. Thus, if we look only to the letter of the law, we shall find the closest resemblance between the two systems; but when we examine them in operation, there is a wide difference. I can make it clear by the following comparison.

There is a well-known argument, that states would not have to complain of a perpetual deficit if they would imitate the economy of private families, which first determine the budget of their receipts, and then reduce their expenses to the level of their income. The usual economy of governments is, on the contrary, to begin with the budget of expenses, and then to create resources,—to find the ways and means to cover them. Now with regard to the poor-law, England follows the example of the State; France acts like the private family. In England the first question is, How much do we want to maintain our paupers? And then measures are taken to raise the sum which has been found necessary. In France the assistance given is limited by the amount which it has been found possible to raise. This result is one very contrary to all that we might have expected. In a country which is supposed to be essentially individualist we see a system established which is rejected by France—a country infested with socialism—as being too socialist. In a nation which has a just right to boast of its self-government, the administration is allowed to interfere much more profoundly in charitable affairs than it would be allowed to do in the most centralised nation of the globe.

Then take the religious aspect of the case, for religion is a power which the statesman cannot overlook. Now religion only imposes upon us the duty of giving freely and willingly, and it denies the merit of an act of forced charity. Moreover, religious legislation has fixed a limit for the obligations of charity—the tithe, or tenth part; but the poor-law often exacts more than two shillings in the pound. Again, where is the gratitude of the pauper for the charity of which he is the object, if this charity is simply a debt due to him by the known provisions of the common law? Again, is it not strange

that England, the classical home of practical common sense, the country where the relations of cause and effect are so exactly calculated, should adopt the principle of charity imposed by the law, while France, that nervous excitable nation which does battle for ideas, insists, in spite of the letter of the law, that public charity should remain practically a voluntary act?

I might, like the well-known character of one of Scribe's pieces, seek for the minute causes of these great effects. I might say that the French legislator forgot to give a practical sanction to his law, when he left his *bureau de bienfaisance* without any power of levying rates on the inhabitants of the commune. I might also make believe to think, that when he charged the commune with the maintenance of the poor, without giving it the means to support them, he only wished to impose on the people a solemn farce of quack charity. But there is no need to invent reasons, when I find in the very nature of things arguments against obligatory assistance of the poor, and when I find nothing to prevent my believing that these arguments were present to the minds of the French legislators.

In reality, the French have never got beyond the principle which may be expressed thus,—“The poor man has the right to demand assistance, but no one is obliged to give it,” except in special cases, to which I shall refer in the sequel. I go further, and I say, that the word ‘right,’ *droit*, as used in the law, must not be taken literally; it means simply *title*. “The poor man is *entitled* to demand assistance;” or, in other words, poverty, or the absolute want of the necessaries of life, is the only valid reason for a man's asking his neighbour to supply those necessaries. The beggar who has money in his pocket is punished both as a vagabond and as a cheat, who has abused the confidence of the public.

I cannot but approve the French way of regarding the question, since I have strong objections against charity legally compulsory. First, the recipient of such charity is *ipso facto* degraded, as though he were made a prisoner, or a serf. He becomes a *pauper*. He contracts a stain difficult to wash away. It is certain that a man may fall into pauperism by accidents over which he has no control,—by commercial changes or by sickness. If in such cases he only receives an accidental relief, discreetly applied, the workman will feel no humiliation, and will take the first opportunity of raising himself again; but if the relief is official and public, he will either starve rather than suffer the degradation of accepting it, or his ideas of his dignity as a man will be effaced. And when this has once happened,



he will recur more and more often, and under less and less pressure, to the charge of the parish. The certainty of finding shelter and food, whatever happens, must have a bad influence on the character. The French proverb says, Help yourself, and Heaven will help you; in England you may add, If you don't help yourself, the parish will help you. If the voluntariness of charity has no other effect than to accustom men to depend more on their wits, and their arms, and God's providence, than on their neighbour's assistance, this alone would be a grand result.

But old and sick people and children cannot help themselves. This is another reason for not humbling them by the manner of doling to them their daily pittance. Yet it must be owned that when the number of these poor creatures has become so great as to require a mass of administrators to take care of them and maintain them, and large sums of money produced either by poor-rates, by private subscriptions, or by charitable foundations, the relief will be distributed in a business-like way, often accompanied with rude words, which do not come from the heart, but may pierce it, and light up there a flame of hatred instead of gratitude and love. And here I do not speak of abuses properly so called.

In the second place, legalised charity is objectionable in relation to the man who performs it. It is no longer a question of the self-imposed sacrifices of those who would rather deprive themselves of something than see their neighbours suffer. While poor-relief depends on this feeling, to give it is to procure for oneself a moral enjoyment. But when the poor-rate is granted, and stuck up on the church-doors; when the collector comes to ask you for a good round sum, without giving you the choice of making a spontaneous resolution, or a voluntary sacrifice;—then you only think of the burdens which your neighbour imposes on you. If, again, the rates were always low, people would pay them without grumbling, as they pay other taxes, especially if the effect were really to make beggars disappear from the streets, and to provide a relief for every one really destitute. But such a result has never been obtained. At times the rates have been so high that the less prosperous inhabitants of the parish have had to contribute such a large proportion of their income as to reduce them almost to the class of poor. This is simply to transplant the evil, and not to cure it; it is rather to give its incidence a more dangerous direction. In all cases, wherever charity is obligatory by law, the expense is much heavier for the ratepayers, even when the strictest economy has been introduced into the administration of the funds.

There are yet two other objections which may be made on behalf of those who are legally compelled to be charitable. They only apply to the mode in which the law is carried out in England, but they tend to prove that the law itself is either impossible or unjust. First, then, the law charges the union, parish, or township, to provide for the necessities of the poor by a proportional assessment upon the property or rental of the inhabitants. I cannot see how, in practice, this could be otherwise. Yet it involves a real injustice. For if in my parish there are a hundred paupers, I shall pay in poor-rates perhaps 20 per cent upon my rental; while in the next parish, where there are only ten paupers, and where the proprietors are more rich, the rate only amounts to about one per cent.

But is there any necessary bond of union between the inhabitants of the same parish? They are a mass of men, accidentally in juxtaposition, who may to-morrow be quite differently placed. Hence, the country or the State should give the relief,—supposing that charity is to be compulsory,—and the poor-rates should be equally assessed on every portion of the commonwealth.<sup>2</sup> With the present parochial system, the ordinary laws of finance, on which all taxation is founded, are inverted. For the poorer a parish is, the higher are its poor-rates; and the richer it is, the less it has to pay.

The second of my two objections concerns the *arithmetical proportion* of the *poor-rates*. The two terms which I have put in italics represent a confusion of ideas. A society which admits the right of relief ought, logically, to establish its assessment on a progressive system. If the man who has an income of 1000*l.* pays 10*l.*, the man with 2000*l.* a year should pay 30*l.*, and the man with 10,000*l.*, 500*l.* The last would still have 9500*l.* a year, and with this sum he will be a much richer man than the first with his 990*l.*, or the second with his 1970*l.*

But why has no nation as yet adopted progressive taxation or progressive poor-rates? Is it for all those fine reasons of the political economists, who have more or less perfectly expressed the repugnance of the majority to any such system? Not at all. Up to the present moment I do not remember having ever seen in print the only real and valid argument that can be made against progressive taxation,—and that is, the arbitrary way in which the proportions must be fixed.

<sup>2</sup> It seems to me unjust in principle, though perfectly legal, that the Lancashire parishes should be bound to support the whole weight of the present calamity.



Suppose a man has to pay 10 per cent on a rental of 1000*l.*, how much should he pay on 1500*l.*, on 2000*l.*, on 5000*l.*, or any other annual revenue? I defy any one to show me any method of fixing the amount, which shall not be purely arbitrary. Hence the present arithmetical proportion must be maintained, for it alone gives a *general law*; it alone, therefore, is practically possible. And yet in practice it turns out to be unjust, because it presses on some, and involuntarily favours others.

I have shown that compulsory charity prejudices those who receive it and those who give it. It will now be easy to demonstrate that it labours under other general disadvantages which prejudice the whole commonwealth. "Poverty is the mother of invention," because hunger is the great stimulant; whereas the certainty of always having enough to eat gives great strength to that force of inertia which every man has to overcome before he can work. In such circumstances, the progress of the nation is not as rapid as it might be. Moreover, I am very much disposed to believe that the poor-rates have contributed, if not to create pauperism, at least to extend it, and keep it up in its exaggerated proportions. In old days an unemployed population lived wretchedly on the pittance of alms that was daily distributed to them at the doors of every convent; and there are still plenty of men who would rather eat dry bread without working than feast on fat things at the cost of toil and exhaustion. It is for the maintenance of such drones in our hives that we impose on ourselves a heavy burden of taxation, which at any moment may almost paralyse the action of the State. And, indeed, England has seen how unhappy may be the consequences of compulsory charity; and although the new Poor-Law Amendment Act and other subsequent enactments have done away with many abuses, it cannot be pretended that the organisation is yet perfect. I will produce a proof, a single one, but decisive. There are more beggars in London than in Paris.

How is it that there are beggars at all in London, with its workhouses, and its law which declares that "every indigent person, whether a native or a foreigner, being in any district of England or Wales in which a fund is raised for the maintenance of the poor, *has a right* to be supplied with the necessities of life out of that fund?"<sup>3</sup> How is it that these beggars are unwilling to ask for the relief to which they have a right? And how is it that we so much oftener hear of persons dying of hunger, or fainting in the streets from starvation, in London

<sup>3</sup> 43 Eliz. c. 2, and subsequent Acts.

than in Paris? Why is destitution so much greater in the English capital? Because in London charity is obligatory, while in Paris it is left to the free choice of the charitable,—for it is in fact free, in spite of the great promises held out by the letter of the law.

Let us now examine, in some detail, the mode of giving public relief in France. Strictly speaking, no one has a *right* to charity in France; nevertheless the law *orders* relief to be given to two kinds of destitute persons,—children, legitimate or illegitimate, who have lost their parents by death or otherwise, and lunatics. But these two kinds of relief are not so much works of charity as measures of police. For on the same principle as that on which the penal code<sup>4</sup> commands every citizen, under pain of fine and imprisonment, to lend his aid in cases of fire, flood, brigandage, or public calamity,—because the social bond forbids that any one should be left to perish before every means have been tried to save him,—the law must impose on the authorities the obligation to maintain infants too young to gain their own living, and persons who have become irresponsible through the loss of their reason.

The expenses of maintaining infants and lunatics have been considered too great to be imposed on the commune, and injustice would often have been the result of making the commune alone pay the cost of a measure of general interest. Hence it is the department, answering to the English county, which bears the burden. The departmental fund appropriated to the maintenance of lunatics amounts to about five millions of francs, and that for the maintenance of infants to about six millions. To prevent misunderstanding, I must at once add that these sums are not sufficient to maintain either the 25,000 lunatics who are confined in the public and private establishments, or the orphan and deserted children the number of whom generally exceeds 100,000. The government, the communes, and, in the case of lunatics, the relations, bear a greater or less proportion of the cost.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Art. 475.

<sup>5</sup> In 1853, the last year for which the official report has been published, the expenses of the 23,031 lunatics charged to the departments were in reality divided into the following proportions:

The departments contributed . . .	4,894,904 fr.	or 69·86 per cent.
The communes and hospitals . . .	1,741,027	„ 24·85 „
The relations of the lunatics . . .	370,396	„ 5·29 „
	<hr/> 7,006,327	<hr/> 100

The great Hospital of Charenton, supported by the State, is not comprised in this return.



For the children, the various sources<sup>6</sup> of income which the commissions of hospitals can draw from seem strangely inadequate to the results actually obtained from these funds. But if great effects are produced by small means, it is because only a small number of children are kept in the 163 hospices. The immense majority, or rather all the healthy children, are sent into the country, and distributed in private cottages, where they are brought up by labourers or artisans, who receive an indemnity till the child, at the age of twelve years, is bound apprentice. Very often the children remain with their foster fathers and mothers, and the government favours their establishment or their residence in the country. Those who do not remain in the country are bound apprentice to artisans; while the girls become dressmakers and needlewomen. I think that in many respects it would be better to make them domestic servants. Nowadays a young girl cannot live by her needle, by lace-making, or any like trade; she sinks into distress, and, left without guidance or advice, she easily falls into bad courses. The young servant, on the contrary, is watched over by her mistress; she has advice and guidance; at all events she is fed, clothed, and housed, and enabled to lay-by some savings for a rainy day.

Orphan children and lunatics are the only destitute persons who are in all cases relieved. In their case, the estimate of expense is first made, and then the departments are called upon to furnish the necessary sum, whatever it may be. The case is different with the hospices and hospitals. These establishments have generally some real or funded property, annuities, or incomes from legacies. They receive, moreover, a comparatively small contingent from the communes, and are

<sup>6</sup> The following is a return for the year 1853. The figures have not sensibly varied for twenty-two years.

Produce of special foundations . . . . .	7,815 fr.
Incomes of the hospitals . . . . .	1,738,711
Produce of fines and confiscations . . . . .	239,203
Contributions of departments . . . . .	5,797,645
Contingent furnished by communes . . . . .	1,572,628
From other sources . . . . .	71,432
	<hr/>
	9,427,434

Of this sum 7,903,237 fr. are expended upon children at nurse in the country. The rest goes to support those who remain in the hospices, and for general expenses.

With regard to the communal contingents, ministerial circulars of 1839 and 1840 declare, "It should not be lost sight of, in fixing the communal contingents, that the expense of foundling children especially is to be borne by the departments."

The incomes of the hospitals are generally derived from charitable foundations.

entitled to a share of the poor-man's tax (*les droits des indigents*), which I shall have to explain further on. Of a total sum of rather less than seventy millions of francs, the communes, or parishes, pay only about ten millions, while the tax on public amusements in favour of the poor brings in a million and a half. Almost all the rest comes from private sources.

The 1324 hospices and hospitals which exist in France are in some respects like minors of independent property, but under the guardianship of the communes. Each is administered by a commission, generally of five members, named by the prefect, and presided over by the *maire*. The hospices are the asylums for the old and infirm, the hospitals are for the sick. While there are beds vacant, they receive all who present themselves. When all the beds are full, there is nothing more to be done.

In ordinary seasons the number of beds is generally sufficient; but in periods of great calamities, or of epidemics, the sick are not left without relief. This would be as contrary to the general interest as to charity. In such cases the commune has to assist its hospital, or if it has no hospital it founds a temporary infirmary; while the government has to assist the poorer communes. But in all this there is nothing obligatory. It is an act like one of private beneficence.

To a certain extent we may say the same of the *bureaux de bienfaisance*. These *bureaux* are, it is true, the agents of the relief given by the public; but their powers are extremely limited, and in several respects their method is that of a private association. I am even disposed to think that the inconsiderable powers granted to them must be an evidence that the French poor are generally pretty well off; for, if their needs were very pressing, they could never be satisfied with such gentle measures. If there were great destitution, if the evil were radical, energetic remedies would have been required as measures of public safety. If England had not had her civil wars, Charles II. would not have renewed and consolidated the act of Elizabeth, which had almost fallen into oblivion. So in France, exceptional states of public depression have given occasion to vigorous measures, which have been forgotten and renewed as periods of prosperity and adversity succeeded each other.

Thus, many of the French kings, beginning with St. Lewis, had appointed, under different names, persons who were charged with the duty of relieving the aged and infirm. But they seem to have paid little attention to the case of able-bodied workmen out of employ. Francis I., by letters patent of 6 Nov. 1544, created a general *bureau* of the poor at Paris,



composed of thirteen burgesses, named by the provost of the merchants (answering to the lord mayor), and four councillors of the *parlement*. This *bureau* had the right of levying an annual tax of alms for the poor upon the princes, lords, ecclesiastics, and proprietors. This tax was still levied in 1789; but it had no resemblance to the English poor-rates. It was not a tax proportioned to the income; and there was no means of recovering from the subscribers more than they had put down their names for. In fact, it was only a collection, such as is still made.

An edict of Henry II., 9 July 1547, continued the work of Francis I. and set up similar *bureaux* in other towns, where they continued till the Revolution. The rest of France was left to private charity, or to the charitable foundations, or to Draconian ordinances against beggars, which were never executed.

The Revolution of 1789 shook the very foundations of society in France, and caused a vast increase of destitution, which obliged the government to turn its attention that way. There were, moreover, two different reasons, both very strong, which induced the government to occupy itself with the poor. The first was, that the unemployed labourers formed a tumultuous and undisciplined army, which threatened to become dangerous; and the second was, that the treasury was empty, and that the sieve might for the moment be replenished with the goods of the hospitals.

For all these reasons, the decree of March 2, 1793, declared the relief of the indigent to be a national debt. Every year the legislature was to vote the necessary funds, and these funds were to be distributed among the departments, in proportion to their presumed necessities. By reason of this vote, all the property of the hospitals and other foundations became useless, and was to be sold for the benefit of the treasury, as a national property.

In every canton (a division comprising several parishes) an agency was to be set up to distribute the relief. The relief was to consist in work, home-relief, relief given to the sick in the *maisons de santé*, and to the aged and infirm in the hospices.

Health-officers, or doctors, were to be appointed in all places, to attend the sick poor at their own homes gratuitously, and midwives for the women whose names appeared on the indigent roll. Establishments for saving persons from drowning or suffocation were also included in the general system of the law. All begging was suppressed, and all distribution of alms in money or kind at the doors of public or private

establishments was forbidden. Finally, to crown the work, and to assist the citizen who might desire to lay-by something for the future, the law promised to establish a National Bank of Providence (*Caisse nationale de Prévoyance*). It was a complete Utopia. The only thing to be regretted in this law, which of course was never executed, is, that it forgets to tell us what it means by a "Bank of Providence."

The law of the 7th Frimaire an V is that which established the system that is now applied to the whole of France, Paris excepted, with the modifications which I shall bring out in the remainder of this article. The law ordains that the municipality shall set up at least one *bureau de bienfaisance* in each commune, and more if the needs of the poor population require it. Each of these *bureaux* is composed of five members, whose services are gratuitous. They have nothing whatever to do with the management of the money, but they name a paid receiver who collects it.

When there is more than one *bureau* in one commune, the municipality divides the general fund among them, in proportion to the indigent population which each has to relieve; the *bureaux* have also to accept through their receiver, who keeps a register of such gifts, every thing which charitable persons may choose to contribute. And they are bound, as far as possible, to give the relief in kind.

This same law imposed, under the name of poor-tax, or *droit des pauvres*, an assessment of ten per cent on all tickets for theatres, or other places of amusement opened daily or every two days, for concerts, &c.; subsequent acts imposed a tax equal to a quarter of the gross receipts on public balls, or accidental theatrical performances where a charge was made for entrance. Afterwards the hospitals were allowed to share the product of these taxes with the *bureaux de bienfaisance*, but the loss was made up by the restoration of such part of the confiscated property of the hospitals as had not yet been sold, and by the permission to make collections in the churches and temples, and from door to door.

Let us now see what the results of this law have been, and what amendments it has received, always remembering that we are not speaking of the city of Paris, where the regulations are somewhat different.

The administrative commission, or court of direction, for the *bureau de bienfaisance* always consists of five members; but since 1830 they have been named by the prefects. The prefects may also suspend a director from his functions, and may ask the Minister of the Interior to dismiss him. They fix, according to the regulations of the financial laws, the security



which each receiver is bound to furnish, and they choose the receiver from a list of three persons submitted to them by the commission.<sup>7</sup> The prefects also oblige the members of the *bureau* to draw up a set of rules, about the number of their sittings, about their agents and *employés*, and their functions, about the mode of distributing the relief, and other special arrangements.

The members of the *bureau* are only named for five years,<sup>8</sup> and one member should go out in rotation each year; but in reality they keep their places as long as they like. This is a mistake; for an unfortunate choice is sometimes made, and the law of rotation would eliminate an incapable member without the affront of a dismissal. The *curé*, or parish priest, may sit as a simple member of the *bureau*, but not as president or vice-president.

Although the Frenchman is supposed, not without foundation, to be exceedingly fond of honours and decorations, it would be a mistake to think that he shows any exceptional earnestness in striving for a place to which no pay is attached. Not to speak of Germany and other countries, the expensive contested elections for the honorary places of alderman, lord mayor, or member of Parliament, which we sometimes see in England, rarely find their parallels in France. Now the functions of the members of the *bureau de bienfaisance* are often laborious, and are such as cannot be intrusted to the first comer, but only to a man who enjoys the esteem of his fellow-citizens. Hence the government has been obliged to reckon the services of the commission as civil services done for the State, and to declare them capable of being recompensed with the Cross of the Legion of Honour. But it does not follow that all the members attain that recompense.

In spite of the intention of the legislature, and of the encouragement of the administrators of the law, the functions of a member of the *bureau de bienfaisance* do not enjoy so much consideration as they deserve, or as they were meant to have. People always prefer being on the administrative commissions of the hospices, although the intention was that the *bureau de bienfaisance* should be the principal thing, and the hospice only the accessory or the complement. In fact, it is the hospital commission which comprises the most influential persons of the place; and although there is no law against the same persons being at the same time members of the *bureau de bienfaisance*, this accumulation of functions is rarely seen.

<sup>7</sup> Generally it is the municipal collector who is also collector for the *bureau*.

<sup>8</sup> Decree of 1852.

The reason is, because on the one hand the hospices have larger revenues, and the administration of them is therefore of more importance, while on the other the duty of visiting the poor is more onerous and troublesome than that of attending the board-room of the hospital. Moreover, the communes seem to favour the hospices and hospitals; but this perhaps may be explained by the fact that there is a minimum expense, below which the hospital cannot be maintained at all, and which therefore the commune is obliged to provide for, unless it allows the establishment to drop; while for the *bureau* there is no such minimum; it has only to distribute whatever sum there may be; for when there is nothing, it can distribute nothing.

And, in spite of the letter of the law, there is not a *bureau de bienfaisance* in every commune. In France there are nearly 37,000 communes.<sup>9</sup> But in 1837 there were only 6,715 *bureaux*; in 1847, 9,336; and in 1853, 11,409.

In 1847, the 9,336 communes which had each its *bureau de bienfaisance* comprised a population of 16,521,833 inhabitants. These communes were thus classified: 347 were chief towns of departments or of arrondissements (that is, towns where a prefect or sub-prefect resides); 1,875 were chief towns of cantons (market-towns); 7,114 rural communes (country villages); 16 chief towns of arrondissements; 97 chief towns of cantons: and more than 27,000 rural communes were therefore without any *bureau*. But it should be noticed that the population of the communes that possessed *bureaux* formed almost the half of the total population of France, and that they comprised all the important towns, where destitution is always most intense. On the other hand, the *bureaux* are far from being equally distributed among the different departments. The ten in which they are most numerous (Lozère, Basses-Pyrénées, Nord, Gard, Seine, Drôme, Seine-et-Oise, Basses-Alpes, Oise, Aube) have one *bureau* to every two communes and every 1,500 inhabitants. The ten departments where there are fewest *bureaux* (Corsica, Pyrénées Orientales, Loire, Loire-et-Cher, Côtes-du-Nord, Bas-Rhin, Vienne, Finistère, Dordogne, Allier) have one *bureau* to twenty-five communes and 30,000 inhabitants. In Corsica there is only one *bureau* to seventy-one communes and 46,000 inhabitants.

This disproportion may be explained by the concurrence of two facts which at first sight seem to be contradictory. The departments where there are most *bureaux* are some of the

<sup>9</sup> 36,829 in 1856. The number varies slightly from year to year, because fresh communes are occasionally formed by the division of old ones, or two or more old ones united, for different reasons, generally financial.



richest, and also contain the *greatest number of indigent persons*. Thus in the first ten departments of the above lists the inhabitants pay on the average 57fr. 52c. a head in rates and taxes;<sup>10</sup> but at the same time there were 398,403 indigent persons, that is, one to every ten inhabitants of those departments, and 50,839 beggars, or one in 101 inhabitants; while in the other ten departments the average taxation only amounted to 27fr. 73c. a head, and there were only 74,089 indigent persons, or one for fourteen inhabitants, and 30,093 beggars, or one in 133 of the population.

Still there is one point on which I have come to no decided conclusion; that is, whether in these last departments there are fewer (known) indigent persons because there are fewer *bureaux*, or whether there are fewer *bureaux* because there are fewer poor. But I am inclined to think that, as the relief they give is so insignificant, the creation of *bureaux de bienfaisance* does not tend to increase the number of indigent persons, but only to make their real number known. Strictly speaking, an *indigent* must be thus defined: "A person inscribed upon the list of the *bureau de bienfaisance*." It is only to this class of persons that exemptions from the payment of fiscal and judicial dues are granted.

Moreover, it must be acknowledged that there are indigent persons who are not inscribed on these lists, since there are so many parishes and communes where no *bureau de bienfaisance* exists. On two occasions a census has been made of the whole number of *indigents* and beggars in France. In 1829 Villeneuve-Bargemont counted 1,320,659 *indigents* and 198,153 beggars; and in 1847 M. de Watteville counted 1,586,340 *indigents* and 337,838 beggars. I do not guarantee the exactness of the number of beggars, but I think that the numbers of *indigents* may be accepted with confidence.

We have next to examine how many of these persons are relieved, and what is the quantity and the efficiency of this relief. In 1837 the number of persons relieved by the *bureaux de bienfaisance* was 806,623, and the average amount of the relief given to each person in the course of the year was 9fr. 25c. In 1847 there were 1,185,632 indigent persons relieved, at an average cost of 14fr. 20c. In 1853 the number relieved was 1,022,996, and the average cost was 12fr. 0·5c. a head.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> I consider the mean amount of taxation per head to be an approximate sign of the riches of a country.

<sup>11</sup> The yearly average of the numbers relieved for the following periods was—

For 1833-1837	751,311
„ 1838-1842	813,210
„ 1843-1847	925,274
„ 1848-1852	982,516

It will not be uninteresting to give fuller details of the year 1853. The receipts of the 11,409 *bureaux* which then existed amounted to 25,056,131fr., and were composed of the following items :

Ordinary receipts . . . . .	7,093,548fr.
Extraordinary receipts . . . . .	9,375,017
Balance from 1852 . . . . .	8,387,566

---

25,056,131

The ordinary receipts are made up of nearly three millions derived from rent of real property, of interest of funded property and annuities, and of 577,965fr. from the poor-tax on theatres, concerts, and the like. The extraordinary receipts are made up of about a million and a half, the produce of collections, thirteen or fourteen hundred thousand francs of donations and legacies, four millions and a quarter of grants by the communes, &c. ; and various other receipts.

It must not be forgotten that the number of poor, and the amount of receipts which I have just given, are not calculated for the whole of France, but only for those communes where there are *bureaux de bienfaisance*. In the other communes poor persons also are found, and they are relieved by private charity, distributed either by charitable individuals, or by benevolent associations. There is no means of estimating the amount thus distributed. But, in all cases, this mode of relief has one advantage over the official *bienfaisance*, for it costs nothing. In the *bureau*, although the administrators are not paid, there are inferior agents, and a staff which costs nearly 13 per cent of the whole sum expended. The following is a statement of the expenses for the year 1853 :

Cost of the <i>bureaux</i> . . . . .	2,238,148fr. or 12·90 per cent.
Relief <sup>12</sup> . . . . .	12,328,467 „ 71·05 „
Invested . . . . .	2,783,312 „ 16·05 „
Total . . . . .	17,349,927 „ 100

These twelve millions of francs are far from equalling the enormous sums spent for the same object in England. It is true that in the British isles the able-bodied are relieved

<sup>12</sup> The relief consisted of the following particulars :

Food . . . . .	7,190,491fr. or 58·32 per cent.
Clothing . . . . .	794,186 „ 6·44 „
Fuel . . . . .	570,620 „ 4·63 „
Other relief in kind . . . . .	1,253,133 „ 10·16 „
Money . . . . .	2,520,053 „ 20·45 „
	<hr/>
	12,328,467 100



as well as the aged and infirm, while in France the latter alone are *in general* relieved. And what is given to them? From four to eight pounds of bread, and a few pounds of meat a month, and in winter fuel for some four or five days. And with this they forbid the indigent persons inscribed on the list to ask for alms from private people. But this prohibition exists only in theory, as may easily be conceived.

Though the French law does not permit a poor man to summon a *bureau* before the magistrate, in order to force it to relieve him, the *bureaux* are not hard or difficult in giving relief. In each place there are rules and traditional customs which fix the age and the manner of relief; and when an indigent person presents himself, one of the administrators, or in the great towns a commissaire, or voluntary assistant, goes to inquire into the truth of the alleged destitution. When women come to ask for relief, the *bureau* asks a *dame de charité*, or in some places a nun, to inquire into the case. These ladies, the number of whom is seldom fixed, are benevolent auxiliaries of the *bureau*, which receives their assistance with gratitude. The *dame de charité*, who distributes the official relief, must not be confounded with the charitable lady who gives alms according to the impulse of her own heart.

When the state of the poor person has been ascertained, his name is put on the list of the *bureau*. Generally there are two lists, one for cases of temporary relief, the other for those cases where age or infirmity cuts off all chance of work. Unfortunately, these lists are more elastic than the funds; so that it may happen that as the destitution increases the means of relieving it may proportionately decrease. When a *bureau* has 1000fr. to spend, it can give ten francs a piece to 100 poor persons; but if 200 come, there will only be five francs for each. It is often found necessary to be very severe about admitting fresh applications, in order to make the relief given more efficient.

When we look closely, we shall find that the difference between the French and English methods is not so great as might be thought. The members of the board of guardians are not paid. Only they are named, not by a prefect, but by the rate-payers. The poor are divided into able-bodied and infirm. In France the able-bodied are not generally relieved; in ordinary times there is no money to do it with: hence they seldom apply, and if they cannot make out an extraordinary case of misery and want, the *bureau* gives them nothing. Hence there is no need of workhouses in France, either as a test to ascertain whether the alleged poor man

was really destitute of all means of livelihood, or as a check to guard against the abuse of charity. Neither can we assume that a Frenchman who does not shrink from having his name put on the list of *indigents* would shrink from entering the workhouse. If France ever decided upon granting its poor a real *right* to charity, it also must have workhouses; even now the doctrine is held that the way to relieve the able-bodied poor is to procure them work: in periods of calamity *ateliers de charité*, charitable workshops, are established, and beggars<sup>13</sup> are taken to the *dépôts de mendicité*, which are real workhouses, where the labour is obligatory. But if we take the able-bodied poor out of the account, it is on one side the boards of guardians, on the other the *bureaux de bienfaisance*, who decide by their own judgment on the relief to be given to children, the aged, and the infirm, and who examine, or cause their own officers to examine, the circumstances of the applicant for relief.

Yet there is a considerable difference in the two systems, both for the giver and for the receiver. The Englishman pays his poor-rate, the Frenchman gives what he chooses to the collector. So much for the givers. For the receivers, the English pauper receives an efficacious assistance, since he has enough to eat, and is clothed and housed. The French poor man in most cases receives a relief which is a mere mockery. The French *indigent* is generally, *but not always*, treated with less harshness and rudeness than the English pauper; but who can say that he would not prefer a little less form and a little more substance, a little less politeness and a little more food?

Thus far I have proceeded without reference to Paris, though the statistics of its relief are comprised in the figures which I have given above for France. But it will be easily understood that Paris has always occupied a peculiar position; it is the seat of government, it is richer in resources, its poor are more numerous, and it is the heart of France; and when it suffers, the whole body suffers with it.

I have not room to say much about the times before 1789. It is certain that the number of *indigents* was then very considerable, that beggars swarmed, that their trade was handed down from father to son, and that the most severe measures, the whip, the black-hole, the cage, and even the gallows, could not frighten them. And, indeed, how could such exaggerated penalties be applied? Except-

<sup>13</sup> Begging is a misdemeanour in France, and the tribunal condemns the beggar, or vagabond, to the punishment of a confinement for so many weeks or months in the *dépôt de mendicité*.



tions must always have been made in favour of the blind, and a crowd of other infirm people. How could a man be punished for having lost his arms? Exception led to exception; the law was eluded, and became obsolete. However this may be, when relief was first organised in 1791, out of a population of 550,000 there were 120,000 inscribed on the lists of the *bureaux de bienfaisance*. In the beginning of 1861, Paris, with its newly-added banlieue, numbered a little more than 1,500,000 inhabitants in its twenty arrondissements; and of these there were only 100,488 on the lists of *indigents*.

Properly speaking, it was the ordinance of 16 July, 1816, which gave the official charity of Paris its present organisation. It put an end to the anomaly of the forty-eight *bureaux* which then existed (one for each quarter) being completely independent of each other, the effect of which was, that as the poor prefer, or are forced to prefer, certain quarters where lodgings are cheaper, in these there was one indigent to every three inhabitants, while in the rest the proportion was one to twenty or more. So the forty-eight *bureaux de bienfaisance* gave place to twelve *bureaux de charité*, under the direction of the Prefect of the Seine and of the Council of Hospices. These new *bureaux* were composed of the *maire*, his assistants (*ad-joints*), the *curés*, and Protestant ministers, and twelve administrators named by the minister of the interior, and each assisted by a number of *commissaires* (visitors of the poor) and *dames de charité*.

The *maire* is the president of the *bureaux*, and each of the twelve administrators is charged more particularly with one of the twelve districts into which each arrondissement is divided. The duty of visiting the poor, reporting on their cases, and distributing the relief, devolves upon the *commissaires* and upon the *dames de charité*. One of the members of the *bureau* must be present every day, at a certain hour, in the office, to make provisional grants, and to pronounce upon the urgent cases that may be brought before him. Every year the *bureau* submits its accounts to the Council of Hospices.

To each *bureau* there were attached lawyers to give gratuitous advice, physicians, surgeons and medical students, midwives, and Sisters of Charity. The lawyers may be done away with since a new institution, *l'assistance judiciaire*, has been established to give gratuitous advice.

Two lists of *indigents* are made out, one for those who receive temporary relief, the other for those who receive a permanent allowance. These last are subdivided into four classes. The number of persons to be admitted into each class, and the sum to be given to each person, are fixed year by

year; and these figures must not be exceeded. The relief is, as far as possible, given in kind, and no *indigent* receives a permanent allowance unless he sends his children to school.

After 1830, several changes were introduced into the regulations of the *bureaux*, of which I shall only mention the following. The name *bureau de charité* once more became *bureau de bienfaisance*; the ministers of religion ceased to be *ex-officio* members, but they might be nominated; the charity schools, where the poor sent their children, were taken in hand by the municipality of Paris, and maintained by the communal funds as *free schools*; the members of the *bureaux* were freed from the obligation of being present in rotation every day in the office to pronounce upon urgent cases; and finally, the classification of the poor was not carried out with so much rigour.

In 1849 there was a new organisation. This time the system of strict centralisation was applied to the *bienfaisance* of Paris; it changed its name into *assistance*, and was placed under a director. This functionary is under the orders of the Prefect of the Seine, and he at the same time directs the administration of the hospitals and hospices; he is assisted by a council of *surveillance*, composed of men eminent for their character or office, such as senators, councillors of state, physicians, great employers of labour, and the like.

It is interesting to note the spirit which has inspired these successive changes of name. In 1816 it was religious, and took the name of *charité*; in 1830 it became philanthropist and humanitarian, and took the name of *bienfaisance*, or benevolence. In 1849 it became a civil matter and a branch of the administration, and took the official name of *assistance*.<sup>14</sup>

Whatever we may think of these changes of name, it is certain that the present organisation of the service has proved of great use to the poor. Two important amendments are especially due to it. One is the creation of the *secours d'hospice au domicile*, or home-pensions. It consists of monthly pensions, instead of admission into the hospice, granted to old people who wish still to live among their families. The number of these pensions is limited beforehand. The other amendment, which is still more important, is the institution of a complete system of relief for the sick at their own houses; by this means every indigent sick person may be efficiently treated and liberally relieved, whether or not his name has been previously inscribed in the registers of the *bureau*. This system keeps out of the hospitals many persons who live with

<sup>14</sup> The constitution of 1848 recognises the *right to assistance*.



their family and can have attendance, and only want relief, medical advice, and medicine, to get them out of their trouble.

When a director of "public assistance" was appointed, the *bureaux de bienfaisance* did not therefore lose what may be called their autonomy. The central administration, on the contrary, distributes a great deal of relief through them, and gives them a large annual contribution. And although the secretary-treasurer or the receiver always has the "management of the money," and the administrators "cannot touch the funds," yet in practice the severe regulations of the financial laws<sup>15</sup> have necessarily been somewhat loosely observed; for if the receivers collect the money, the administrators and their *commissaires* distribute part of it with their own hands, at least under the form of a cheque payable to bearer. They have always in their pockets bread or meat tickets to distribute to casual poor who are in actual want; and with these tickets the *indigents* go to the butcher or baker, to receive a portion of bread or meat. But the administrators do not distribute cash; if a money payment is to be made, they give a ticket upon the secretary-treasurer, who pays it. The *indigents* who are permanently inscribed on the list are relieved by monthly distributions at the office of the *bureau*. In these circumstances, we cannot really talk of charity, where the left hand knows not what the right hand is doing. Neither can we pretend that there is no abuse, no favouritism. How can it be expected that among hundreds of individuals there should be no one unworthy of the confidence placed in him? But such cases are the exception. And if all the members of the *bureaux* are not moved by religious considerations, or by the spirit of the purest philanthropy, if some act from motives of vanity, what does it signify to society? There are men who scrupulously fulfil their engagements, who are most useful members of the *bureau*, and very polite to the poor, whose only motive is the desire of winning some honourable distinction. If this is a weakness, it is a very pardonable one. It is one that I do not share, but still I am not entirely and firmly convinced that it is really a weakness. Till now I have only seen declamations on the subject, but not a single argument.

But I must give a few figures to complete the statistics of public assistance at Paris. I take the numbers for the year 1860, the last for which the accounts are yet published. They

<sup>15</sup> According to the financial laws of France, the agents of the minister of finance, and in general the accountable agents who have given security, alone can receive cash. The functionaries who have the right to order a sum to be spent—such as the minister, the prefect, or the *maire*—can only do so by an order upon a receiver or payer.

refer to Paris with its banlieue, the population of which was 1,696,141 in 1861. The board of public assistance received in all for that year 19,877,367fr. 78c. This total is composed of 7,537,647fr., the contribution of the municipality of Paris; 1,614,340fr., the produce of the poor-tax on theatres, &c.; different payments made by the department of the Seine and the city of Paris for the maintenance of lunatics and foundlings, amounting to nearly three millions; and 600,000 or 700,000fr. contributed by private persons. Almost all the rest is from the revenues of the hospices, hospitals, and other foundations of Paris. Subtracting the municipal contribution, the real revenue of the board amounts to 12,339,720fr. The total expense for 1860 was 20,245,403fr. 49c. There was therefore a deficit of 368,035fr. 71c., which has to be covered either by economy in subsequent years, or by increase of receipts, or by a gift of the municipality. Of this sum, only 3,261,488fr. 45c. were spent in home-relief; but this does not include a sum of 798,210fr. 27c., the produce of the collections made by the *bureaux de bienfaisance*, of which each *bureau* has the free disposition.

The accounts of the board of public assistance give us, among others, the following details respecting the distribution of this relief. The aged who have completed seventy-four years, the blind and the paralytic, receive, "according to their classification and their respective conditions, and also within the limits of the fund to be disposed of, a monthly fixed allowance (special relief), the amount of which increases with the age of the receiver from 5fr. to 12fr." This is exclusive of the tickets for bread (8 to 16lbs. a month) and meat (2 to 4lbs.), which are distributed from the special funds of the *bureaux*. 64,455 individuals partook of this "special relief."

Besides this, 853 old persons (320 men and 533 women) received the *secours d'hospice*, or home-pensions of 253fr. a year for the men, and 195fr. for the women. These pensions are given to individuals who remain with their families; they are, then, a species of out-door relief, given instead of the indoor relief of the hospice. Only a hospice for the aged is not a workhouse, for no work is done there; it is only an almshouse, or *maison de retraite*, and its inmates are perfectly free.

But it must not be supposed that all the aged partake in these—I was going to call them—favours. The favoured are few. To be admitted among them, a person must have been an inhabitant of Paris for five years at least, and his name must have been inscribed for two years in the register of the *bureau de bienfaisance*. And then he must wait for a vacancy. I cannot give my readers any assurance that a powerful patron



may not put an *indigent* in the pension-list before his turn ; for patronage is powerful every where. Still, the poor person who enjoys both his "home-pension" and the gifts of the *bureau* enjoys a real relief of his destitution.

The attendance on the sick at their own homes in 1860 cost nearly 675,000fr. There were 37,382 applications, and the number of days of sickness was 522,463. The average expense was 18fr. 69c. for every sick person attended, and 1fr. 27c. for each day's illness. When an application for medical relief is made, the board sends one of its forty-six visitors, or paid agents, to investigate the case. Their report decides its admissibility, but the board does not always relieve it. About one-third of the applications is refused. These visitors must not be confounded with those of the *bureaux de bienfaisance*. The board of public assistance has a numerous paid staff, which costs from 800,000fr. to 900,000fr. a year. But the *bureaux* have only a secretary, a treasurer, and a few inferior officers. The board, especially in its earlier years, was more official in its forms than the *bureaux*, which often imitated the action of private charity ; but now much is left to the discretion of the paid visitors, and it is possible that real amendments have been made in this respect.

Nor must the visitors who investigate the cases of the applicants be confounded with the Sisters of Charity who visit and nurse the sick poor. Each Parisian *bureau de bienfaisance* has several relief houses (*maisons de secours*), where three Sisters of Charity live, and where the poor receive certain simple medicines when they apply for them. On set days a medical man attends at the house, and gives advice to every sick person who applies to him. The new administrative regulation of 28 July 1860 orders that one of the administrators shall also attend to give relief in urgent cases, and to distribute tickets for medicine and clothing. The medical prescriptions are made up in the official laboratory. There are also tickets for baths, for fuel, and other necessities. The sisters are paid at the rate of 50fr. a month by the *bureaux*, with lodging and firing. They give account of what they expend, and are really the agents of the *bureau* for the treatment of the sick poor at their own homes. I suppose that the small salary of these nuns must be completed by an allowance from the mother-house on which they depend.

It will be seen that in this article I have not touched upon the subject of private charity. There are, of course, great institutions, pious foundations, and charitable societies, which publish their accounts. These we may know ; but who would venture to estimate the sums which are given in France

and England by those whose left hand knows not what their right hand does?

The official *bienfaisance* in France is not confined to the institutions and measures the great outlines of which I have just sketched. There are many other cases in which it assists private charity. It contributes to the *crèches*, where children under two years of age are nursed; to the *salles d'asile*, where children from three to seven years old are received; to the primary schools, to which the poor are admitted free; to the workrooms, where girls are taught to sew; to the lying-in societies (*de charité maternelle*), which assist women in childbed; and to hundreds of other useful establishments.

During a commercial crisis, when the factories are closed and the workmen out of employment, charitable workshops (*ateliers de charité*) are set up. The communes make an extraordinary rate, and the state makes advances from the treasury. Then certain public works, reserved for the occasion or extemporised, are undertaken, for there is always something that may usefully be done; and work is found for men who ask nothing more than to be allowed to gain their bread. Extraordinary circumstances justify exceptional measures.

I will not draw out this sketch to greater length; and I do not see that I need return to the comparison between the English and French methods of relief. I hope the reader will have seen clearly that, wherever the difference between the fundamental principles does not stand in the way, there is a perfect similarity between the two systems. The same causes have the same effects, and men are every where the same. As to the principle of compulsory relief, it cannot be applied unless some measures are taken to prevent the numerous abuses which it must produce; and these compensating measures cannot fail to change the expression of the principle. For instance, the charitable relief will be distributed with rudeness, and a certain harshness, quite unlike the kindness of Christian charity. This is the natural consequence of the union of two things so essentially heterogeneous as a sentiment and a duty.

MAURICE BLOCK.

---



GENERAL AVERAGE.<sup>1</sup>

MARITIME adventure has become so ordinary a part of the daily life of this country, that it is necessary to go back to very old times in order to form an idea of the expressive force of the word "adventure."

The bold pioneers who, in times which would have been accounted old in the earliest days of Greece and Rome, first found for themselves a way where there was no path or track, were "adventurers" in a more emphatic sense than those who are still fairly accounted so. The shipowner who now selects an educated master-mariner to command his ships, who despatches them to well-known and frequented ports, who sees them well provided with compass, chronometer, chart, and sextant, who, seated in a commodious office, takes all the securities for the safety of his craft which modern science offers, and still indemnifies himself as far as he can by surrendering a portion of his expected gains in the shape of a premium for insurance to the underwriter,—is still fairly called an adventurer, in consideration of the uncovered risks he is still liable to. The merchant who puts the same money-value into many different ships, and has ordinarily less at stake in any one venture than the shipowner, who contracts with the shipowner for the carriage of his goods—saving always the perils of the sea—and insures against those perils, is still an adventurer. The charterer, who hires a ship from the owner, lets it out piecemeal to the merchant, and insures his freight with the underwriter, is an adventurer. They are all of them bound up together in an adventure, against the failure of which they can

<sup>1</sup> General Averages Consolidation. Draft of a Bill (printed only) intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the Laws relating to General Average Sacrifices and General Average Contributions."

A Selection of leading Cases on Mercantile and Maritime Law. With Notes. By Owen Davies Tudor, of the Middle Temple, Esq., Barrister-at-law, author of "A Selection of leading Cases in Equity," &c. London: William Maxwell, Henry Sweet, and V. and R. Stevens and Sons; Hodges, Smith, and Co., Dublin; and Bell and Bradfute, Edinburgh.

A Handbook of Average. By Manly Hopkins, Average Adjuster. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

General Average, and the Losses and Expenses resulting from General Average Acts, practically considered. By Laurence R. Bailly. Second edition. London: Effingham Wilson; Liverpool: Webb and Hunt.

A Treatise on the Law of Marine Insurance and Average: with References to the American Cases, and the later Continental Authorities. By Joseph Arnould, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-law, and late Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford. Second edition. In two volumes. London: V. and R. Stevens, and G. S. Norton, H. Sweet, and W. Maxwell.

only partially protect themselves, and are subject to losses against which no policy of insurance indemnifies them. But theirs is a money-risk. Secure at home, they know nothing of danger to life, limb, or liberty; and as their judgment in the selection of voyage or wares is good, bad, or indifferent, they win, or lose, or merely with difficulty hold their own.

But the case was different with those first adventurers who, joining an indomitable courage to a restless activity and a sound and penetrating judgment, first encountered the perils of the sea in distant voyages. These men were owners (*i. e.* shipowners), navigators, merchants, all in one. And lines of communication between far distant countries had long been opened, the modern practice of the separation of these various callings had long been adopted, one maritime state after another had enjoyed and lost the empire of the seas, Tyre, Crete, Rhodes, Athens, Carthage, and Rome had risen and fallen, before compass, sextant, or chronometer had diminished the risk of distant voyages, or the underwriter had stepped-in to share it—in a pecuniary sense and for a money-consideration—with those who planned and carried out the adventure. Limiting ourselves to the money-aspect of the risk, we may say that these men were adventurers, and afterwards co-adventurers, in a sense now unknown.

Our subject has nothing to do with maritime adventure until its risks became divided between several parties to one and the same adventure. The owner and navigator of the ship, who was also owner of the cargo, had no accounts to settle with any one; he took all the risks, pocketed the profits, or bore the loss. But when the owner of a ship contracted to carry the goods of one or more merchants, mutual relations came into being, and required to be equitably considered and adjusted. There arose a community of interest and a partnership of peril, which commenced with the loading of the ship, and only terminated on her arrival, and the landing of the goods. Some losses would naturally fall where what is called accident directed them. Ship or goods might be damaged by the elements; or the voyage might be prolonged until the goods had lost a profitable market, or had perished by decay. Such losses, the result of accident, and unavoidable under the circumstances, would have to be borne by those on whose property they fell. Losses by perils of the sea—injuries done by the elements—are in modern legal language called *particular average*, *i. e.* an average—whatever that word may mean—which is to be borne by the particular interest on which the loss falls. But other losses might arise which were avoidable, and which were intentionally and



advisedly encountered for the common benefit. Thus, the ship and goods might be ransomed from the enemy or from pirates, or goods might be thrown overboard to lighten the ship in a storm. Such losses should evidently, by the simplest principles of equity, be borne by all the parties to the adventure, in proportion to the benefit which accrued to them respectively. Such losses are called *general average*.

The subject is at this moment of more practical importance than ordinary: for, in view of the inconvenience which has arisen from the various systems adopted by this and other countries in defining the various acts which are to be accounted of the nature of general average acts, and in settling the various rates of contributions which are to be made by each interest benefited by them, attempts have of late been made to establish an international code; and it has been with this intention that the proposed "General Averages Consolidation" Act has been drafted. The attempt originated with a section of the Social Science Congress at Glasgow; and this draft Act has been put forward as the result of their deliberations, and a first indication of the extent of those alterations in our own laws which it is thought by some persons expedient to make, in the hope that other countries will then assimilate their codes to our own amended law; the importance of some uniform code being derived from the fact, that all general-average losses may be settled, not necessarily in the country where the parties interested in them may reside, but at the port of destination of the ship, or, in some cases, at the accidental port of refuge to which the ship may be driven, or which she may seek, and that the law by which the nature of the loss and the rate of contribution are decided is the *lex loci*.

There is no doubt that the word "average" in its mercantile sense was not at first used in conjunction with the prefix "general." It will shortly appear that, whatever may have been the original meaning of the word, the idea conveyed under it, according to its subsequent use, is that of "loss," provided loss be interpreted so as to include expense. Thus, general average is a general or partnership loss, and particular average is a particular or private loss.

We receive the fundamental theory of general average from the Roman law, although indirectly. But this law was only the reproduction of a more ancient one. If the goods of a merchant were thrown overboard to lighten the ship, and thereby save the adventure, the Rhodian law (over 900 years B.C.), which was no doubt derived from more ancient sources, or the expression only of the previous *lex non scripta*,

provided that the parties benefited should indemnify the injured merchant. "*Lege Rhodiâ cavetur, ut si levandæ navis gratiâ jactus mercium factus est, omnium contributione sarciantur quod pro omnibus datum est,*" says the Digest. This Rhodian law, as adopted by the Roman, was introduced into England at the time of the Norman Conquest; but with the thing, the word was probably not imported, as it does not occur in the text of the law, which uses the word *contributio*, and in one place, as we shall afterwards see, *tributum*, to express what would now be called average. From this it would appear that the idea of average related to contribution and not to loss, except as loss is involved in contribution. If so, it is probable that average in its original use would not be applicable to accidental losses, which would fall on the interest affected by them, and not be a subject of contribution.

Stevens, an early English writer, and one who first in this country pursued the statement or adjustment of claims by merchants or shipowners against underwriters as a profession, gives a derivation of the word from the Latin *habere*, the Italian *avere*, the Saxon *healp*, &c., by which it and they are made to signify *partnership*; in this case the word *general* is redundant. The explanation is convenient, and gives a meaning in which the word might very well have been used. But the Saxon *healp* has nothing to do with the question, and the other words do not mean partnership, if, by a figure, *healp* ever did. When we cry "halves," we no doubt claim partnership, but between two parties, and in equal shares. Even supposing the use of the word *healp* to have been extended to many parties, and in any proportions, there is no doubt at all that the word to examine is the Latin *averagium*. This was a tax payable by the tenant to the lord, originally in the shape of affording the use of the tenant's beasts of burden for the lord's use; it was the duty of transport or carriage. This would, though we are unable to quote an authority, naturally be commuted afterwards to an equivalent tax or money-payment, assessed on the tenant in proportion to his wealth in beasts of burden, which again would probably be in proportion to his holding of land, and be called by the name of what it replaced. Average would thus be a rateable tax, and this fully uses up the word in its new application. In a maritime adventure, if goods were thrown overboard to lighten the ship, and so to save it and the rest of the goods, the interests benefited paid a tax rateably assessed on their values to indemnify the owner of the goods thrown overboard or jettisoned. This would come upon the parties taxed as a loss, and would be so



entered in their profit-and-loss account. Thus average would be loss, and other losses would also be called average; but, to distinguish them, the one sort would be called *general* (or partnership, or common), others *particular* (or private), and others *petty* average. *Averagium* itself was probably derived from *habere*, and was an acknowledgment of the *having*, or *property*, or *dominion* of the lord.<sup>2</sup>

The Rhodian law was, according to Molloy, introduced into England by William the Conqueror. But the word, with some extension of the principle, was a pacific achievement of Richard the First. The extension of the principle we shall notice hereafter.

The Romans were never merchants at heart; and it was as jurists and lawgivers that they adopted and promulgated the Rhodian code. Amalfi, now an insignificant Neapolitan town, was the head-quarters of maritime enterprise at the time of the Conquest; and at the commencement of the eleventh century, the *Tabula Amalfitana*, rather than the *Jus Rhodium*, was the maritime law of the Mediterranean. In this code the word 'average' first occurs, and from thence it was adopted into the *Laws of Oleron*, compiled under the direction of our Richard the First, about the close of the twelfth century. But Richard was Duke of Guienne as well as King of England; and there is some doubt whether the Laws of Oleron were ever current in England. The town of Wisbuy on the Baltic was once the commercial centre of Northern Europe, and with some additions the Laws of Oleron were adopted there. At least this seems a more probable opinion than that which would make them an independent variety of the Rhodian law. These laws were adopted by the cities of the Hanseatic League, whose commercial enterprise and importance threw Amalfi and Wisbuy into the shade; whilst their proximity to our shores, and the nearer approximation of their provisions to our own practice, suggest that to the laws of Wisbuy, rather than to more ancient foundations, we must look for the basis of our own law.

If we are right, then, the word "average" has no connection with partnership, in which case the prefix of "general"

<sup>2</sup> *Averare*, 'to carry,' is proposed by Marshall as the root of the word; but this word is itself, like *averagium*, probably derived from *habere*; and *to carry* was called *averare* because it was the mode of acknowledging the rights of the lord, and of fulfilling the condition of tenure. Stevens, in the derivation of "average," interpolates *halverage* as a step between *healp* and *averagium*. The sound is doubtless tempting, and the meaning captivating; but it is certain that medieval Latin and all European languages without exception have not adopted a Saxon word of very late date to express average, which means tribute or contribution, not partnership.

would be unnecessary. But it means a tax assessed on value. This tax was a loss, and the word came to be used for marine losses generally. General average was a general or partnership loss, falling on all interests at stake; and particular average was a particular or private loss, falling on the particular or private interest on which it happened to fall by what is called chance, and for which no other interest was called on to contribute. The word was used for "tax," because "*averagium*," or the act of carrying, or rather of fulfilling the duty of carrying, was a tax.

This sense of the word is, we might almost say, demonstrated by an expression in the Rhodian law, which has escaped the notice of those writers who have attempted to explain the derivation of the word, and its applicability to its use in the marine vocabulary. Speaking of the effect of a jettison which is unsuccessful, and does not save the ship, the law gives as the reason why, in that case, there should be no contribution, that *tribute* is due when the ship is saved, inferring that otherwise *tribute* (or tax) is not due: *quia jactus in tributum, nave salvâ, venit*.

We think that this use of the word "tribute" to express average quite clears up the matter of derivation, which the learned Émérigon says had not been cleared up in his time, "*et peut-être*," he adds, "*il ne le sera jamais*."

To pass, then, from the word to the thing signified. It is certain that the equitable principle, that a man has no right to obtain the safety of his own property by the destruction of his neighbour's, without making good his neighbour's loss, was from the very earliest times applied to maritime adventures. It was, as far as is known, first expressed in the Rhodian law, and is now acknowledged by legislation or by enforceable custom in every country in the civilised world. There is no conflict of laws, nor any need of an international code, for the recognition of this principle.

But before this principle can be applied so as to lead to a concrete result expressed in pounds, shillings, and pence, there are three points to be settled. First, What are the acts which give rise to a claim for a general contribution to make good the loss incurred by them? Second, How is the value of the property which has been destroyed or sacrificed to be estimated? Third, In what proportions is this damage to be made good? or, in other words, how is the value of the property subject to contribution to be estimated? We will take up these points briefly, in the order in which we have stated them; and then consider how far it is desirable to make the proposed changes in our own law, with the view of ulti-



mately obtaining from other countries such changes in their codes as will establish uniformity between them and our own amended law.

I. What are the acts which give rise to a claim for general contribution?

There is one which from its absolutely universal recognition, and from its antiquity, may be said to be the great type of a general average act. It is the jettison, or throwing overboard of a portion of the cargo in order to lighten a vessel, and so escape a pressing danger affecting the safety of all the interests at risk. So much is this act held to be the type and model of all acts giving claim to general contribution, that it has been proposed that no act should be admitted to be of the nature of a general average one unless it might have been commuted for a jettison. This, however, is an extreme view which has never been adopted.

But there is a limitation even in the case of jettison; for the goods jettisoned must not be the special cause of the peril to avert which they were thrown overboard. Thus, if a bale of goods were in a state of combustion, their sacrifice would not be made good by the other interests which they had in fact injured by exposing them to peril.

Again: the jettison must not be a rash unconsidered act, but there must be reasonable cause and a fairly judicious selection. Thus, if it were necessary to lighten the vessel, and a box of doubloons were thrown overboard instead of a box of lead or iron goods of the same weight which could be got at, the jettison would be a tort, and the remedy of the injured shipper would lie against the shipowner and master. The co-adventurers are not liable to make good to the injured merchant the clearly wrongful act of the master. In a moment of peril too nice distinctions cannot be, and are not required to be, drawn; but as much deliberative judgment must be used as the occasion admits of.

It was formerly considered theoretically necessary that there should be actual consultation between master and merchant or supercargo, or between master and mariners; but this is now certainly not necessary, and, perhaps, was never practically held to be so. Targa distinguishes jettisons as regular and irregular. The regular is one made after deliberation and consultation; the irregular is made at the moment of extreme peril, when formalities and discussion are out of season. He adds that, during sixty years of experience at Genoa, he had only met with four or five instances of regular jettison which were suspected to be

fraudulent, "for the sole reason that all formalities had been too well observed." In the leading case of *Birkley v. Presgrave*, Lord Kenyon, in delivering judgment, observed that "the rule of consulting the crew upon the expediency of such sacrifices is rather founded in prudence, in order to avoid dispute, than in necessity; it may often happen that the danger is too urgent to admit of any such deliberation." These last words, omitted by Mr. (now Sir Joseph) Arnould, in his citation of the judgment on the very point in question, would rather lead to the inference that the consultation was to be held, when possible. We prefer the statement of Mr. Justice Story in *The Colonial Insurance Company v. Ashby*: "A consultation with the officers," says that learned judge, "may be highly proper in cases which admit of delay and deliberation; but if the propriety and necessity of the act be otherwise sufficiently made out, there is an end of the substance of the objection." The expression "may be highly proper" lends but small importance to the act, whilst the expression of what is really essential is clear and definitive. Mr. Chancellor Kent, in the same vein, says, after giving but small importance to consultation, that "it must appear that the act occasioning the loss was the effect of judgment and will." We have no doubt at all that no formalities are necessary in any case, although they may be advisable in some. The master is armed with all authority; and if he decide on any jettison, it is a good or bad act according as it was an advisable or unadvisable one, judged, not by the event, but by the circumstances of the case, so far as they were within his knowledge at the time.

Another limitation was well-nigh universal in ancient codes, and is pretty general in modern ones. It applies to the case of unsuccessful jettison. If goods be thrown overboard, but the ship be nevertheless lost during the continuance of the same peril which the jettison was made for the purpose of surmounting, and if some goods be saved, they are not (according to most authorities) liable to contribute to make good the loss of the goods jettisoned. So says the French Code of Commerce; and the Spanish Code is, we believe, the only one that enacts otherwise. In our own courts the point has never been decided.

Those who argue against the existence of any claim say, that what is saved belongs to its owners; for that shipwreck having intervened, and the peril sought to be averted having been actually encountered, it is a simple case of *sauve qui peut*, and the adventure is terminated. Benecke, a sound and original thinker, and a very learned writer, is of the contrary



opinion, and holds with Weijtsen, with the Spanish law, and probably with the Swedish ordinance, that as the goods jettisoned might have been saved to their owners, at least in part or in a damaged state, although they have not contributed by their sacrifice to the preservation of other goods which have in fact been saved, they ought to have the benefit of an interest in what has been saved. Those goods which are saved might instead have been thrown overboard. But as, by the act of the master, other goods were selected for the purpose, these goods ought to share in whatever benefit may accrue to those actually saved.

Mr. Chancellor Kent and Mr. Phillips, an American writer, take opposite views on this point, each citing cases decided in the American courts, which he considers to tell in favour of his view. So far as these cases are concerned, the chancellor, who holds to the old doctrine, seems to have the best of the argument.

The tendency appears to be towards admitting the claim of the goods unsuccessfully jettisoned to contribution from those saved. But we are ourselves inclined to the other view. On a point on which such authorities as Pothier, Benecke, and Weijtsen can be quoted against Emérigon, Valin, and Kent, a difference of opinion may be permissible as to how the question ought to be judicially decided if it should arise. The ground for the inclination of our own opinion is, that the event has not justified the act of the captain, or benefited any one. Such a jettison is one of the perils of the sea, the loss accruing from which falls on the interest injuriously affected by it. It is an accident, and not the result of a sound or discriminating judgment. It is surely more inequitable that persons who have received no benefit should be called on to pay as if they had, than that a person whose goods might possibly have been saved should lose something by the imperfect exercise of the judgment of the master to whose care he committed them.

Another limitation to any claim for contribution is to be found in the condition that the goods jettisoned must be legally on board and properly stowed, otherwise there is no claim for contribution, although, in some cases, there may be a remedy against the master or shipowner.

One other point alone remains to be noticed. Mr. Bailly contends that to justify a jettison—i.e. to give a claim to general contribution—there must be a moral certainty of total loss. "There must be a moral certainty of total loss when the act is performed," he says; and Sir Joseph Arnould accepts the dictum rather doubtingly, and in default of a

better; "Mr. Baily's test," he says, "seems as satisfactory as any."

Now, in the first place, we must object to the use of the word "moral," as calculated to mislead. The nature of the case does not admit of certainty of any other nature than moral; and the use of the word, as an expressed qualification of certainty, is not only unnecessary, but suggests an inferior degree of certainty to some other kind, no other kind being, in point of fact, attainable. Considering the nature of the subject, it seems to us that the author's only possible meaning is fully expressed if we omit the word "moral," and read the sentence "there must be a certainty of total loss," &c. But ninety-nine ships saveable by jettison out of a hundred in the same position would probably be lost if this moment of extremest peril were waited for. All authors agree that there must be extreme peril; but we cannot find that any of them, by extreme peril, mean the certainty of loss. In fact, under the certainty of loss, the value of the sacrifice diminishes to zero. No one can pretend that the moment should be waited for when judgment or discretion in selection would become impossible, and when a box of gold might as well and justifiably be cast overboard as an equally weighty one of lead.

Benecke lays down the contrary opinion unhesitatingly. Speaking of another description of sacrifice, that, namely, of a portion of the ship or of her furniture, he says: "When a vessel is in a perilous situation, it is the master's *duty* to use all endeavours to extricate the ship and cargo intrusted to his care from such peril; and if in so doing, sails are blown away, masts are sprung, or the hull of the vessel injured, this cannot entitle him to restitution, because he has done no more than he was bound to do. Again, if his situation were such that, but for a voluntary destruction of part of the vessel or her furniture, the whole would *certainly* and *unavoidably* have been lost, he could not claim a restitution, because a thing cannot be said to have been sacrificed which had already ceased to be of any value. But if there be a possibility of saving the ship and cargo without voluntarily destroying part of the vessel or of her furniture (which possibility is to be supposed in most cases), and the master deliberately resorts to this measure, because he thinks it better to sacrifice a part than risk the whole, then he has made indeed a sacrifice for the benefit of all concerned, and is entitled to restitution." This passage refers to another act indeed than a jettison, but the principle is the same, and Mr. Baily applies his dictum to all acts of the nature of general average, whether the sacrifice be made by jettison or in



any other way. We shall shortly come to the description and discussion of these other sacrifices.

Mr. Phillips differs from Benecke with respect to the point that the *certainty* of loss destroys the claim to compensation. "The more imminent the peril is, the less questionable," he says, "seems to be the claim for contribution on account of a sacrifice made to avoid it;" the meaning of which we take to be, that there are different degrees of peril which justify jettison; but that the greater the danger, the more unquestionable the claim to contribution. This, though we cannot accept it, is against Mr. Baily's view; as instead of making certainty of loss the test, it allows of different degrees of peril, and makes certain loss only the most complete and evident justification.

Mr. Baily calls the theory which we would maintain the "jeopardy" theory, objects to it as "loose and inaccurate," and says that it gives rise in practice to frequent disputes and inconsistencies. But as the question is one of evidence as to the propriety of an action—that is, whether the circumstances were such as to make a jettison a proper and advisable act—the objection is inherent in this as in all other like questions. To say that the jeopardy theory is inaccurate, is only begging the question; to say that it is loose, and may give rise to disputes and inconsistencies in its application, is true, but not to the point. The certainty of total loss is, after all, a matter of opinion, and may give rise to as many disputes and inconsistencies as any other matter of opinion. Of the two, it would be easier to adduce before a jury conclusive evidence of great peril, and the consequent propriety of a jettison, than to establish the certainty of total loss if the jettison were not made, and the consequent necessity of the same act. Mr. Baily is an average stater<sup>3</sup> in very large practice, and must be familiar with the evidence which is laid before those who have to make good a jettison by their contributions. He must be quite aware that it is most unusual even to aver the certainty of total loss, and that the ground of great peril is that which is usually alleged. However much he may disapprove the "jeopardy theory," we have no doubt that he adopts it in practice.

We cannot quit this part of our subject without a few words on Mr. Phillips's objections to Benecke's observation, that the *certainty* of loss destroys the claim to contribution. Mr. Phillips says, that "it is inconsistent with cases of un-

<sup>3</sup> An average stater, or an adjuster of averages, is one who examines the claims of shipowners and merchants against underwriters or *inter se*, and, from the evidence laid before him, states them.

disputed claim for contribution, as, for instance, composition with pirates." The truth we believe to be, that practically the "certainty of total loss" is hardly to be established; and that by consent of all parties the circumstance, if it could in any case be established, is included in the "jeopardy theory." As to composition with pirates, it would be clearly impossible to establish the certainty of total loss by them. The very circumstance of their accepting a composition would be strong evidence that they were not in case to make sure of the whole prize, and there would always remain the probability, more or less, of recapture and restitution.

Salvage services rendered to a ship in distress are perhaps, next to jettison, the most undoubted and indisputable claim for general contribution. Now it is sufficient to establish, as a foundation for a claim for salvage services, that a ship was *in distress*. To adopt Mr. Bailly's theory, it would be necessary to go much further before such services could be paid for by a general contribution. It would be necessary to show that if these services had not been rendered, the ship and cargo would certainly have been lost.

Jettison is so much the type of a general-average act that we have thought it worth while to dwell on it at some length. We have hitherto found in it but little trace of any conflict of laws, and it would appear so far to be indifferent in what port, and under what code, the question should be argued. But this applies only to the simplest part of the case, whether or no the jettison should be considered a general or partnership loss, or a particular (or private) one.

II. How is the value of the property which has been destroyed to be estimated?

The equity of the case is abundantly plain. The owner of the goods should be *indemnified*, and so be treated as if his goods had arrived and been sold as he intended, and as the goods of others actually have. The contributories should be the interests at risk, and supposed to have been saved, and they should contribute in proportion to their value *as saved*. Now the interests at risk are the cargo, the ship, and the freight in course of being earned.

With respect, however, to the valuation of the property thrown overboard, the Roman law enacted that the owners should receive the cost-price of their goods. This is not an indemnity to the merchant. It may be more or less; *i. e.* he may be a loser or gainer by this rule. What he loses is the cost-price, minus (1) the freight he would pay on arrival at the port of destination; (2) the duty, landing-charges, and expenses of sale; and (3) his own contribution towards the



loss. For equity requires that he should be put in the same position as if the goods of some other merchant had been sacrificed instead of his own. Moreover, as the loss is a partnership one, he must bear his proportion of it. The cost-price may be more or less than this, according to the judgment with which the goods were selected, or according to circumstances beyond the scope of any previously formed judgment.

This was, no doubt, not overlooked nor left unconsidered by the Roman law, and it was probably as a compensation for the loss on market-value (or of the price fetched, minus the charges incurred at the port of destination) that the merchant was excused from contributing towards the general or partnership loss.

The laws of Wisbuy and the *Consolato del Mare* (a digest published in the fourteenth century, and adopted in the Mediterranean ports) distinguish between a jettison made during the first half of the voyage and one made during the second, and award the cost-price only as the value of goods thrown overboard during the former, and the market-price as the value of those thrown overboard during the latter. This rule was pretty general formerly, and was not only recognised in the Mediterranean and the Baltic, but also in France, England, and Holland; it is, however, now confined to Denmark and Sweden. In Hamburg the custom is to adopt the value as expressed by the cost-price to the owner at the port of departure. With these exceptions, it is, we believe, now universal to value the goods at their market-price at their port of destination, or at any other port at which the adventure terminates; unless the average is settled by the early forced return of the ship to her port of departure, when the cost-price on board<sup>4</sup> is equitably adopted as the value, since this enables the merchants in most cases to put like goods on board. Moreover, if the contribution be then and there settled, there are no means of ascertaining any other value.

But the value of the goods jettisoned being arrived at, the contributory share of the interests benefited, which were at risk, and have been saved, is very variously settled by the laws of different countries. The contributory and benefited interests—those, namely, which were at risk—are, as we said, three,—the cargo, the freight, and the ship.

III. How is the value of the property saved, and subject to make contribution, to be estimated?

Although the value of the goods jettisoned may have been

<sup>4</sup> The cost-price on board is the cost-price of the goods, plus shipping expenses, but without premium of insurance.

equitably arrived at, it is obviously of importance to their owner, as well as to the owners of the interests benefited, that these latter should be equitably valued, since, as we have seen before, he has to pay his share of the assessment. As to the cargo, it is clearly and indisputably equitable that the same rule should be followed in valuing it, as in valuing the goods jettisoned. This is accordingly done; and there are therefore the same varieties in the assessment of the value of the cargo as have been indicated in the assessment of the value of the goods sacrificed. But when we come to the freight and the ship, the law that a general average may be adjusted at the port of destination, on arrival, becomes of very great importance.

In England the rule is, that the freight and the ship contribute in full proportion to their value *as saved*. No doubt there are difficulties in establishing this "value" as respects the ship. (1) Is her value that which she had at her port of departure, minus any damage and wear and tear since sustained? or (2) is it her value to sell in the foreign port in which she happens to be? or (3) is it her value to her owner, if that can be ascertained? or (4) is it her value as stated in any policies of insurance which her owners may have procured?

We do not purpose going into these points minutely, nor would it be easy to lay down a rule of universal application. Science pronounces in favour of the first method of establishing the value of the ship, and rejects the last, which, nevertheless, Benecke pronounces to be frequently the best. The second method, that, viz. of valuing her in her existing state at the foreign port in which she may happen to arrive, is scientifically perhaps as inadmissible as the last; for there is this striking difference between ship and cargo,—that the latter is sent out to be sold, whilst the former is intended to be brought home again.

The Roman law, whilst it decreed that the ship was to contribute its proportion, gave no method for ascertaining this proportion,—that is, for valuing the ship. It is even doubtful whether ship and freight were not considered one interest. Later, it was customary for ship or freight to contribute, at the choice of the master. The *Consolato del Mare* first clearly distinguishes freight and ship as two contributory interests; but having shown what the contributory value of the freight is, it decides that the ship is only to contribute for half its value, without deciding further how this value is to be ascertained. When Leghorn was a great port, the same rule prevailed there with respect to the ship; but



the freight only contributed for a third of its value. The French commercial code fixes the contributory values of freight and ship each at one-half, and determines that the value of the ship, of which value one-half only is contributory, is *the value at her port of discharge*. The Sardinian code is on this point a reproduction of the French. The Spanish follows the same method of valuing the ship,—that is, it adopts the value at the port of discharge; but it makes the whole value so found contributory. The Danish law is the same as the English with respect to freight and ship, except that in the case of freight it deducts one-fifth for wages, *i.e.* the expenses of earning the freight, while in England those expenses are actually ascertained before they are deducted.

It is, no doubt, the difficulty of fixing the contributory values of ship and freight, especially of the former, according to the requirements of equity, which have led to the various rules we have stated. The only one in favour of which there is nothing to say is the French, which values the ship at the port of discharge, thus taking account of wear and tear, and then makes only half this amount contributory. It has been defended by French writers of great authority; but their arguments have displayed the strength of their patriotism rather than the soundness of their judgment. And if we may venture a guess at the origin of such a regulation amongst so acute a people, we should suppose that it was devised as an indirect method of encouraging the shipowning interest. But, however that may be, there is certainly room, in this very important matter of contributory interests, for the provisions of a well-considered international code, if such a code can be attained without undue sacrifices of principle to uniformity.

We have hitherto confined ourselves to the case of jettison; but other sacrifices made to avert a common peril may also call for a general or partnership contribution. We will briefly enumerate the most universally admitted and undoubted examples of such sacrifices.

1. The freight of goods thrown overboard is as much sacrificed for the common good as the goods themselves, and is equally made good by general contribution.

2. If property be lost or damaged, as by being washed overboard when put on the deck to get at other goods which it was intended to throw overboard, or by water pouring down the open hatches, these losses are sacrifices to be made good. It was not, indeed, intended to sacrifice this property, and, in a certain sense, the loss is involuntary and accidental. But, as Benecke justly observes, no one has more right to expose

goods to danger than to sacrifice them intentionally. The law also supposes the *intention of sacrifice* to extend to any damage involuntarily done as a part of the act.

3. Any damage done to the ship to effect a jettison, as by cutting away her bulwarks, or cutting through the cabin to get at the goods, so as to avoid the danger of opening the hatches, must be made good in general average. If the damage to the ship were accidental, as, for instance, if the goods thrown overboard injured her sides, the French code excludes the damage from general average; but by the English practice it is made good; and by the principle above advanced from Benecke, and the supposition of our own law as to intention, such damage should be made good. Not so if the damage were remote—as, if the goods floated, and at a subsequent part of the voyage accidentally injured the ship's side, because such an accident could not be supposed to be in the mind of the master.

4. Any extraordinary sacrifice of any part of the ship or her apparel made by the master to save her and the cargo from imminent peril. Thus, if the vessel is on her beam-ends, and to right her the masts are cut away, or if anchors and cables are slipped to avoid imminent danger to ship and cargo, these and such-like sacrifices are made good in general average.

Some foreign codes—and this is defended by high authorities—allow any damage resulting from press of sail to escape danger, as a lee-shore, or the pursuit of enemies or pirates, to be a general-average loss. But in this country it is not so, the master being considered as in the simple performance of his ordinary duty, to be using the ship and her outfit in the way in which they were intended to be used, and as having no intention of sacrificing them; so that the event of their loss is accidental.

We very decidedly hold by the English law in this view. In fact, in those acts of cutting away masts and slipping anchors, it strikes us that in pretty nearly all cases the master is driven to them by an overwhelming necessity, where, in point of fact, there is no room for the exercise of any discretion, where the articles sacrificed have ceased to become objects of value, and where they are themselves, conjointly with the elements, the immediate cause of danger.

The practice of allowing such sacrifices to be compensated by general contribution is, however, universal, and all contracts are made on the basis of this practice. This is not a point which stands any chance even of being considered in any legislation directed towards international uniformity. Still it is not altogether useless to discuss such points; and, if a



practice has grown up inconsistent with the theory of the subject, to show that it is not a precedent by which to modify the science, but is rather an admitted exception to the operation of a sound theory.

The next two points, on the contrary, are sure to be discussed, and our own law or foreign legislation must be modified before an international code is agreed to.

5. Damage caused to that part of a cargo which is not in a state of combustion, by pouring water down the hold to extinguish a fire, is made good by general contribution abroad, but not in England. As we understand the 18th clause of the proposed new Bill, it is thereby intended to assimilate our law to the foreign codes by making this damage a general-average loss. The objections to this are, that the act of throwing water over a bale of burning goods can hardly be considered discretionary; that the damage to other goods is accidental; and that in many cases, in fact in most cases, in which the ship and cargo were saved, there was no imminent danger of their loss. On the other hand, it may be said that the whole of the interests at stake are in some jeopardy, and that the master must be understood, although not intending to sacrifice or injure the neighbouring goods, to have had in his mind the probability of his doing so in the use of his means. We incline strongly to the opinion of its being more in accordance with the science of the subject to abide by the English law and practice; but we have no doubt that they would be sacrificed to secure uniformity, if uniformity were thought desirable.

6. The wages of the crew, and the provisions consumed by them in a port of refuge which has been entered to repair the damages occasioned by a general-average loss—as the cutting away of a mast—are allowed to be general average in France, in the United States, in Prussia, and in some other countries. In England these expenses fall on the shipowner, on the ground that, in consideration of the freight, he owes the services and maintenance of the crew to the merchants or shippers, be the voyage long or short. A contrary doctrine was, however, at one time nearly established in our courts. Benecke speaks in favour of the allowance of these expenses in general average, on the ground that, when the master sacrificed his mast, it must have been present to his mind to incur the expense of detention as well as of repair, which expense was therefore a part of the sacrifice which he voluntarily made; and this argument, to our mind, quite overrides the consideration of his contract with the shippers. In cutting away his mast he did something *ultra* that contract, and he fol-

lowers up the act by another sacrifice which was necessary to the completion of the safety for which he made the sacrifice, and which became necessary by the act itself, of which it should therefore be considered a part. Mr. Baily, who does not usually evade a difficulty, merely says, that it may be doubted whether the English practice is a *rule* or a *principle* drawn from the duty of the master under the bill of lading.

7. When a vessel, from any cause whatever—whether in consequence of accidental or voluntarily inflicted damage—bears up for a port of refuge for repair, the cost of entering the port, pilotage, harbour-dues, &c., until she is moored in safety, is allowed as a general-average loss in this and other countries. It is a cost voluntarily incurred for the safety of the whole adventure. With regard to other expenses, which may be necessary for the repair of the ship and the prosecution of the adventure,—such, for instance, as unloading the cargo, warehousing, and reshipping it,—there is not the same uniformity.

The custom in England is to charge the unloading to general average, the warehouse-rent of the cargo to its owners, and the cost of reloading to freight. And this on the ground that when the material safety of the cargo is insured by unloading, the connection between ship and cargo is suspended, and the common danger at an end; that the warehousing of the cargo is done only for its safety and preservation; and that it is the freight which is the interest concerned in carrying on the voyage to its completion, and so should pay for taking the cargo on board again. This custom applies whether the damage done to the ship was accidental or voluntary. It is, however, clear, that the reason usually given for charging reshipping charges to freight will not hold, for the cargo is benefited by being taken forward to its market. The only real line of defence for the English custom is that, when the cargo has been unloaded, the peril affecting the safety or material preservation of it is over, and that the community of interest which remains is a community of beneficial interest only, whilst general average requires a common peril. Against this, the objection is, that, in bearing up for the port of refuge and unloading the cargo, the master must have had in his mind the warehousing and reloading of the cargo as necessary consequences of his act. But this does not seem to hold; for the reaching of the port of destination, in preference to any other port, is not sufficient ground for a common contribution: it is to avoid a peril, not to secure a benefit, that an act giving a right to general contribution must be done.

Sir Joseph Arnould, who occasionally devotes pages to



points on which there is no dispute or difficulty, only finds space in his two bulky volumes for the following notice of the charges for warehouse-rent (which we suppose he means by "warehousing") and reloading:

"When in order to repair the ship it becomes absolutely necessary to discharge the cargo, all the expenses of unloading, warehousing, and reloading it, come into general average, because incurred for the joint benefit both of the ship and of the cargo; of the ship, that she may be repaired, and of the cargo, that it may be preserved."

There is no mention of the invariable custom in this country of treating these charges otherwise. The case cited in the note—that of the *Copenhagen*—is inapplicable, and the cases which tend to show that *in law* these charges are general average are not noticed.

We have said what is the *invariable custom* in England, but we are not able to affirm any *settled law*. The cases citeable are certainly against the custom; but these cases are of somewhat doubtful authority, and we incline to believe that if the point were now argued, the custom would be, as we think it ought to be, maintained, so far as the exclusion of the charges in question from general average is concerned. Our legal writers, in discussing such questions, insist strongly that *sacrifices and expenses* must be for the *common benefit* in order to give a claim for general-average contribution; but they are apt to ignore the essential point of *common danger*.

The laws of foreign countries differ from our practice, and perhaps from our law, on this point. It is almost universal that the charges not only of unloading, but of warehouse-rent and reloading, are general average, when the cause of the inability of the ship to pursue the voyage is itself a matter for general contribution, and, in some countries, when the cause is an accidental damage suffered by the ship.

8. The charges for salvage, and for ransom from pirates and enemies, are here and elsewhere universally admitted as general average, except that by Act of Parliament it has been made illegal in this country to pay ransom to a hostile belligerent.

9. When, in order to avoid a lee-shore, or to escape pursuit, the master carries a press of sail, and thereby loses sails or spars, it is the custom in most foreign countries to treat this as a claim for general average; but not so in England. The grounds of the foreign practice are evident. The master is considered to expose the ship's apparel to extraordinary danger for the benefit of the adventure; and if he loses it, having

voluntarily incurred the probability of doing so, he is entitled to restitution. But the English law says, that he only put the apparel to the use it was intended for, and that he is bound by the contract of affreightment to *use* the ship's apparel to the utmost that the exigency of the case requires. The view of the English law is, we think, the right one. To adopt the foreign practice would be a great temptation to frauds on underwriters; and we suspect that any alteration of our law on this point would justly meet with much opposition from them.

10. The case of a voluntary stranding of the ship by the master, in order to run her ashore on a spot more favourable to the partial preservation of ship and cargo, has never been decided in our courts. The result obtained by stranding may be the preservation, although in a damaged state, of both ship and cargo; or the cargo alone may be benefited, and the ship lost. Nearly all authority, short of judicial decision, is in favour, in the former case, of a general contribution. But practice in this country is on the other side. This practice is defended on the grounds, that the situation was desperate and left no option; that there was therefore no room for deliberate voluntary sacrifice; and that no *sacrifice*, properly so called, was in fact made. In the case in which the ship is lost, Mr. Stevens observes, that the object was not that of saving the whole adventure, but of saving the cargo by the sacrifice of the ship; and Benecke applies the principle, that there can be no sacrifice where, by its certain destruction, the object has lost all value.

The Roman law is against a general contribution: "*Amissæ navis damnum* (says the Digest) *collationis consortio non sarciatur per eos qui merces suas naufragio liberaverint;*" and it has been held as a doctrine applicable to other cases, that the event of shipwreck so dissolves the adventure as to put an end to any other question than whose property it is which is partially saved. Emérigon expressly says that the ship must be saved to give ground for a claim for general average, and that otherwise it is *sauve qui peut*.

Both foreign laws and the *dicta* of writers may be quoted on either side; and we think the point rather more an open one than either Sir Joseph Arnould or Mr. Tudor seem inclined to believe it.

11. The last point we shall notice is, that the expenditure of ammunition and the damage sustained by beating off an enemy are grounds for common contribution in foreign countries, but not in England. Our own law and practice is, no doubt, right in theory; and it ought to be maintained.



The expenditure of ammunition is simply using the objects sacrificed for the purpose they were provided for. No doubt the state of warlike preparation of the ship procured her cargo and enhanced its freight; and the danger of an engagement was one which the shippers were prepared to expect and to encounter. The damage sustained was accidental, and not voluntary. Those should, then, suffer the loss upon whom it falls.

If in this and other cases it were thought advisable to assimilate our law to foreign codes, and compensation were awarded by general contribution, it would be well that the science of general average should be kept intact by giving such compensation another name.

It will have been seen that our laws conflict with those of some foreign countries in two leading particulars;—one, the valuation of contributory interests; the other, certain acts which give, or do not give, a claim for contribution.

It is undeniably of some importance, and it would, no doubt, be of some advantage, that these differences should be settled, and an international code arrived at; but it is hardly of so much importance and advantage as is generally supposed. The more the maritime law of this and other countries are assimilated, the less extensive and various need be the knowledge possessed by any one so engaged as to be affected by them—by the shipowner, the merchant, the broker, the underwriter, or the average adjuster. It would no doubt be convenient that any one who knew the English law affecting such questions as he is interested in, should thereby know the law of other maritime nations on those questions. But this appears to be the sum of the advantage—that a certain science would be made of somewhat easier attainment—that a smaller amount of knowledge and of industry would pass muster as a qualification for engaging in pursuits affected by maritime law.

But there are, as we think, great difficulties in the attainment of this uniformity; and there are so many chances of sacrificing what is more valuable than uniformity in attaining it, so many chances of loss on the road, that we should wish the subject to be much more fully considered than it has been, before any decided step is taken.

We believe that our own law is, on the whole, more in accordance with a sound theory of equity than the code of any other maritime nation; and that the difficulty of ascertaining and applying its principles is not altogether without compensation. It has been formed by a series of decisions founded, not on the words of a code, but on the discussion of princi-

ples of equity, on the authority of the most competent writers on the subject at home and abroad, and on the monuments of legislation; and it is subject to the continual revision of more than one court of appeal. Hence it is broader and more expansive than the text of written laws, compiled, as codes usually are, by the learning and industry of one or two persons, who, however vast and varied their erudition, have not the opportunity enjoyed by our courts of hearing both sides of a question argued and reargued by counsel deeply interested in bringing out each his own side of the question, and informing the mind of the court of all that has been previously said or done in the premisses.

It is, no doubt, a work of the greatest public utility—a work which in this country has been too much neglected, and has fallen into perhaps culpable arrear—to harmonise and codify the written law—the acts of Parliament—bearing on any subject whatever of legislation. It is a real inconvenience, and almost a grievance, to have to construe some twenty acts of Parliament to ascertain whether you get a good title to a good railway debenture. But to codify the unwritten common law is another matter altogether. And, if it be ever done, the less Parliament interferes with it the better. We confess to some nervous trepidation at the idea of nice and subtle points of equity being settled in the House of Commons, or at a rather crude piece of House-of-Commons legislation being afterwards patched up, and, perhaps, made just to read and hold water in the House of Lords. We should infinitely prefer that, for some long time to come, counsel on each side should be heard before a competent judge; that his decision, if questionable, should be questioned before the full court; and that the point, if not there decided to the satisfaction of the bar, should be fully reargued before the law-lords in the highest Court of Appeal; than that the same points should be overlooked in the draft of a second-rate lawyer, or roughly settled in the most convenient way, not without reference to the wishes of the more clamorous or influential advocates of some change, which might, indeed, in one view, be a convenience, but which would put law and sound principle in contradiction, and unsettle more in theory than it settled in practice. In a word, we should greatly prefer that the science of general average should be allowed for some time longer to grow, and to be applied, in our ordinary courts of law, than to see it settled once for all between the Attorney-General, his draughtsman, and perhaps the Lord-Chancellor of the day, on one side, and the House of Commons on the other. It is saying nothing against Sir William Atherton, who would have charge



of such a measure, if now determined on by government, to say that he is not even a second-rate merchant-law lawyer; and he and the court he would address are not, for the ascertainment and application of sound theory, to be compared to the men who take part in arguing or deciding such questions at Guildhall or Westminster. It is only by accident that the Attorney-General of the day can be a first-rate merchant-law lawyer; whilst men such as Abbot, Laurence, Park, Maule, and other great mercantile lawyers of past times, are sure to be present as judges and counsel at Guildhall or Westminster, if such men can be found to occupy the bench or to accept a brief.

The Social-Science Congress have done good by drawing public attention, as far as they have done so, to the desirableness of altering the law of general average, and obtaining an international code embodying it. The object will now be thought over and discussed by competent men, and any proposed plans will be considered and canvassed. Let their motto be *festina lente*; and let them avoid prompt action, except after mature and lengthened examination. If they proceed rashly and unadvisedly, they will certainly do harm, in unsettling what by our own law has been wisely settled, or in settling what it requires much argument and learning to settle rightly; and they will very likely do this without the advantage, after all, of obtaining uniformity; for such changes in foreign codes as would assimilate them to our own amended law, might not be made, and must certainly be preceded by negotiations between the governments of this and other countries.

The proposed bill professes, we believe, to be founded on the resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Glasgow, and it is understood to be put forth only to elicit examination and discussion. The committee of Lloyd's have, we have heard, wisely declined to enter into the matter until it has been longer before the commercial public. The alterations in our existing law proposed by this draft bill are, for the most part, of either a doubtful or a mischievous character; and we have no reason to suppose that, even if it became law, foreign nations would modify their codes so as to assimilate them to the new act in those points in which the draft bill retains our existing law, and where it differs from foreign legislation.

But the matter of international uniformity does not lie in so mere a nutshell as to be fully embraced by any possible act of Parliament or modification of foreign codes. The customs of merchants and underwriters do not bend and give to every legislative settlement of questions between them.

Under our own law, and in our own country, there are sensible differences in the adjustment of claims for general average between London and other ports. We also doubt very much indeed, if one adjustment of claims out of ten made in accordance with the usage at Lloyd's would hold good if litigated. Underwriters have hitherto allowed and paid claims which could not be exacted of them, and declined pretty uniformly to recognise other claims which we suspect would be found to be perfectly good at law. Nor is this done ignorantly. The usage at Lloyd's is highly respected, and deferentially considered, if not absolutely recognised, in our courts of law; but in the City it is almost practically supreme. Under such circumstances, it is not quite clear that all difficulties would vanish under a uniform international code. The simple and express provisions of such a code might, indeed, sooner obtain observance than the decisions of our judges or the unanimous authority of text-writers; but those who most clamour for uniformity seem most ignorant that there are other difficulties in the way of uniformity than the conflict of laws.

If the Social-Science Congress wish to make good progress, and are not content simply to discuss and to wait, we think they might hit on a better method of progress than the drafting of acts of Parliament. Their recommendation might perhaps induce the Government to propose to the Governments of the Maritime Powers a meeting of commissioners appointed by each government to investigate and define existing differences in the laws, and between law and practice in each country. This would not be the work of a day, nor could it be very usefully executed unless it were undertaken by able and experienced men. With this information collected and arranged, the Government might proceed afterwards to propose a uniform code, consistent with the theory of the subject, and those principles of equity on which they are based. The publication of their proceedings from time to time would lead to the discussion of the subject by men competent to discuss it, and the differences between respectable authorities might ultimately be reduced within very narrow limits. An easier and more practicable way might be for the Governments of France and England to appoint a commission, and to endeavour afterwards to obtain the adhesion of other maritime powers to whatever might be agreed on. If our polite and philosophical neighbours would give up their inequitable method of assessing the contributory values of ship and freight, we see no cause to doubt that an agreement might be come to.

Before closing our remarks, we must say a word on each



of the four most noticeable works that have recently appeared on the subject.

Sir Joseph Arnould's treatise on marine insurance is most lucidly written. He never leaves the reader in doubt of his meaning; but he is seldom compendious, still more seldom profound, and never original. But the book is a compilation, and the want of originality excusable. If the author had had more time, he would probably have written a much shorter work. He is diffuse and demonstrative on points which are abundantly plain and commonly accepted; but he is deficient in his examination of doubtful or controverted points. Nor is he always correct in ranging and citing his authorities. Thus, in discussing the question whether, if the goods of a merchant be sold to repair the ship and enable the master to prosecute the adventure, and the ship and cargo should be subsequently lost, the goods sold should be treated as if they had been thrown overboard, in which case no contribution would be exacted to compensate the shipowner; or whether such a debt were created by their sale as would survive the loss, and remain as a liability against the shipowner;—he cites the authorities pro and con, gives Benecke as one in favour of no contribution, — of treating the sale as if it had been a jettison,—and in a foot-note refers to p. 192 of Benecke's *Principles of Indemnity*. There is no mention of the subject in that part of Benecke's work; but the reference to the page may well be a misprint; what is material is, that Benecke as strongly as possible expresses a contrary opinion. He says: "If the sale of goods, therefore, be effected for reasons which constitute a general average, it cannot be doubted that a general contribution must take place, whether the ship and cargo reach their destination or be lost. If the cause of the sale be a mixed one, that part will be made good by general-average contribution which was applied to disbursements of that kind, and the owners will be personally liable for the remainder" (*Principles of Indemnity*, p. 273). Nevertheless, Sir Joseph Arnould's work is a very useful collection of cases and authorities.

Mr. Tudor's selection of leading cases is a work, on the other hand, which, inasmuch as it is devoted to maritime law, would rather be improved by expansion than contraction. The author has, in fact, treated too many subjects in one volume, and, as a consequence, has been bound to treat some inadequately, although well and ably. We notice also a very considerable omission in the absence of any thing on the contract of affreightment. Now the subject of marine insurance cannot be adequately treated without laying down the rights of ship-

owner and shipper *inter se*. We have no doubt that another edition of this work will be called for; and as maritime law and insurance are very large questions, this part of Mr. Tudor's matter might then be well expanded into a separate volume.

The treatise by Mr. Baily, and Mr. Hopkins's handbook, are each valuable in its way, but they contrast strongly with one another. The authors are both practical men, engaged in, and familiar with, the subjects they treat of. But Mr. Baily evidently revels in theory and principle; while Mr. Hopkins sails pleasantly down the stream of practice, discussing theories and principles only if they come decidedly and obtrusively in his way, and then dealing with them in no ungentle or pugnacious spirit.

The plan of Mr. Baily's book is very good. He first attempts to establish his theory of the principles of general average; and we have already noticed one of these in which we differ from him. He then gives the rules usually adopted in the practical adjustment of general-average questions, and points out their accordance with, or divergence from, his principles. On those points in which he differs from other authorities, he does not, we think, do full justice to them in the statement and argument of their views; nor does he always consider a difficulty in the application of his own principles so fatal as a like difficulty in the application of the theory he is opposing. He is, we believe, a very able average stater. His work, notwithstanding objections which we entertain to parts of it, is a valuable one; and it would be difficult to treat the same subject fairly in future without reference to it.

---



## HAYTI.

THE story of Hayti links itself to the story of the Buccaneers; and the story of the Buccaneers carries us back to the year following the successful voyage of Columbus across the western waters, when Alexander VI. divided the Atlantic by an imaginary line drawn midway through it from the North to the South Pole, and assigned in full dominion to Spain all lands and islands situated to the west of that line, and to Portugal all lands and islands lying to the east of it. Portugal, if even she had the will, had not the power to make her wide-sweeping title respected; nor could Spain, even at the height of her power, bar against the approach of the enterprising spirits of other nations the fertile wildernesses of which, while unable to use them herself, she grudged the advantages to others. But she plagued and persecuted all interlopers to the utmost extent of her opportunities. Thus, towards the end of the sixteenth century, she forcibly dislodged the French and English colonists who had settled in the island of St. Christopher; and the exiles found a refuge in the small island of Tortuga, which lies off the northern coast of St. Domingo.

This great and fertile island, which, before the French Revolution, deservedly bore the title of "Queen of the Antilles," since appropriated by Cuba, was discovered by Columbus during his first voyage, and named by him *Española*, *i. e.* Little Spain. The native name was Hayti, which is said to mean "mountainous land." The Spaniards settled in the island in considerable numbers, so long as gold could be found in the mines of the interior, and natives existed who could be compelled to work them; but when mining grew less profitable, and the gentle Indian race, unable to bear the oppression of their taskmasters, vanished off the face of the earth, colonisation languished; and the small European population was recruited only by natural increase. To save, if possible, the fast-perishing remnant of the aboriginal inhabitants, Las Casas, the Dominican, suggested the importation of the robust African from the Guinea coast. The suggestion was speedily acted upon, and the Spanish colony gradually rose into importance. Towns sprang up: St. Domingo on the south-eastern, and Samana and Santiago on the northern coast; the domesticated animals of Europe were introduced; and the consequence was, that in a few years, large herds of wild cattle, escaped from the care of man,

roamed over the vast plains and mountain slopes, which are found both in the north-eastern and south-eastern districts of the island.

The exiles of Tortuga, finding themselves cramped for room within the narrow bounds of their rugged isle, soon visited the land whose noble "mornes"<sup>1</sup> rose before their eyes across the channel to the south. The herds of wild cattle attracted their attention; and the temptations of fresh beef, joined, no doubt, to the delights of the chase, led them to commence a system of wholesale poaching upon these rich Spanish preserves. It may be suspected that the cattle were not so entirely ownerless as Bryan Edwards represents, and that the Tortugans, therefore, were not so wholly innocent of wrong towards the Spaniards as he would make them appear.<sup>2</sup> The colonists called the poachers *Bucaneros*,<sup>3</sup> or cattle-hunters,—Anglicè, "Buccaneers,"—and drew the attention of the Spanish government to their proceedings. An expedition was accordingly fitted out, which, landing on Tortuga during the absence of the greater part of the male population on the larger island, made captives of the old men, the women, and the children, and inhumanly put them all to the sword. If this account be trustworthy, it cannot surprise us that the survivors should be inspired with an implacable hostility to the Spanish name; that they should hoist the black flag; and, being joined by desperadoes of all nations, should for sixty years continue to be the terror of the Spanish settlements on either ocean.

Much obscurity hangs over the exact circumstances of motive, time, and manner; but it was about the middle of the seventeenth century when a party of French buccaneers established themselves in the unoccupied western portion of Hayti. The colony grew rapidly, and before the end of the century was of sufficient importance to become the subject of a special stipulation in the Treaty of Ryswick (1697), by which Spain ceded the western half of the island to France. From that time until the breaking out of the French Revolution, French Hayti made the most striking advances in material prosperity. The importation of Negroes from Africa was carried on all this time with the greatest vigour; in fact,

<sup>1</sup> The mountains of Hayti are so named.

<sup>2</sup> See his *History of St. Domingo*, p. 125.

<sup>3</sup> A different account of the origin of both the name and the thing is given in the work entitled *Maritime and Inland Discovery* (Lardner's *Cub. Cyclop.*); but as the writer gives no authorities, we have thought ourselves justified in following Bryan Edwards, who quotes the Père Charlevoix; especially as the matter is of little consequence to the inquiry which is the main subject of this article.



far too vigorously, as we shall see presently, to allow of the colony preserving a secure social equilibrium. The beautiful plains surrounding Cap Français in the Northern Department, and Port-au-Prince in the Western, were all cleared and brought into cultivation: sugar, tobacco, cotton, and coffee, especially the first, were produced in the greatest abundance through the application of an unlimited amount of slave-labour, under the direction of European skill, to a soil of exquisite fertility; and, according to the returns given by Bryan Edwards, the exports of the colony, upon an average of the three years, 1787-9, amounted in value to a sum not far short of five millions sterling, more than two-fifths of which represented the export of sugar.

But this prosperity was dearly purchased by the debasement of the enslaved population. Upon this subject much valuable information is furnished by M. Ardouin in the first volume of his elaborate work, *Études sur l'Histoire d'Hayti*. The writer, an intelligent native of Hayti, who occupied several important posts under the government of President Boyer, evidently regards the achievement of Haytian independence as an important forward step in the development of human progress; and though this feeling, in his position, is perfectly natural, it induces him, like the American dwelling on the history of the United States, to visit with too unqualified condemnation the whole state of things under the colonial régime. Bryan Edwards, on the other hand, whose sympathies are those of a planter, can see scarcely any thing that was criminal, though much that was mistaken, in the conduct of the ruling class before the revolution. European inquirers, uninfluenced by these conflicting prejudices, are in a better position to exhibit with impartiality the true state of affairs; and philosophic writers in France and Germany have, in short treatises, placed the singular vicissitudes of Haytian story in a clearer light than the ordinary reader could extract for himself from the whole mass of insular literature produced by imperialist or republican natives.

The slave-law of France—the famous *code noir* of Lewis XIV.—though far more wise and humane than that of England, was less marked by these qualities, and also more liable to evasion, than that of Spain. The admirable regulation permitting a slave to have himself valued before a magistrate, and, as a matter of right, to purchase his own freedom; that by which a slave-mother could, for a trifling sum, emancipate her infant child at the font; and that giving to the slave the option of changing his master at his discretion, were all unknown to the French code. A slave could be

neither a party nor a witness in any action, civil or criminal; the possession of any description of property was absolutely interdicted to him; and theft or insubordination were visited with punishments of inordinate severity. On the other hand, the *code noir* encouraged lawful wedlock between masters and their female slaves in any case where there had been a previous irregular connection, and emancipated *ipso facto* both mother and children. It subjected the masters to legal penalties for cruel treatment of their slaves; it forbade the separation of families at sales; and it allowed a master to emancipate any slave either by an act *inter vivos* or by will. In practice, however, many of the most humane provisions of the code remained a dead letter. A despotic system of government concentrated all political and judicial powers in the hands of the governor-general and the intendant; and these high functionaries were not always proof against bribery; or even if they were, their agents, and those who had their ear, were generally open to corruption. A rank crop of abuses naturally grew up when favour and privilege took the place of law. Many slaves were emancipated, but for the most part in a less satisfactory way than in the Spanish colonies; freedom was gained through favour, or affection, or accident,—in any way rather than through an even-handed administration of the law. Moreover, in direct contravention of the 57th and 59th articles of the code, the full rights and incidents of freedom were not conferred on the emancipated class; the private rights of the citizen were conceded, but the public rights, such as that of voting for or sitting in any public assembly, or holding any public appointment, civil or military, were studiously withheld from them by the short-sighted caution and jealousy of the whites. The mulattoes, therefore, who formed the bulk of this emancipated class, were, as a body, disaffected to the colonial system, which allowed them just enough freedom and room for rising, to make them see and murmur against the loss of the privileges withheld. Again, the enslaved blacks—to say nothing of the positive cruelty with which they were often treated—were restless and disaffected; because, while freedom was not, as under the modern system of the United States, absolutely out of their reach, they saw before them no clear well-defined legal way of attaining it, as was the case under the Spanish code. They, too, like the mulattoes, were tantalised by the proximity of a blessing, which seemed to be withheld from them by mere arbitrary caprice.

Under a colonial system involving such elements of peril, the colonists, aided by the mother-country, had, in a reckless



pursuit of gain, which has several times in history been observed to blind French communities to the inevitable consequences of their actions, continued to import Negroes from Africa, until, in the year 1790, the slaves were in the dangerous proportion of sixteen to one of the white population. The statistics of Bryan Edwards give the following classified estimate of the population in that year :

Whites . . . . .	30,831
Free coloured <sup>4</sup> . . . . .	24,000
Slaves . . . . .	480,000
	<hr/>
	534,831

When the Revolution broke out, and the crash of the falling Bastille sent a moral reverberation through the whole civilised world, the white colonists, who prided themselves on being quite up with the mother-country in the march of enlightenment, and could expatiate on the "rights of man" with a sentimental fervour worthy of Danton or Marat, applauded vehemently all the early changes that were made in the political system of France. The Negroes in their barracks—many of them had been taught by the missionaries to read and write, and reflect—heard as it were the distant roar of the voices of a mighty people shouting "*Liberté ! Egalité ! Fraternité !*" to the ends of the earth ; and the sound could not tend to make them less discontented with their lot. The mulattoes heard it, and resolved to see if these great words could not be made a reality to themselves. They took their measures well ; their emissaries in France represented their claims to leading members of the National Assembly, who undertook to redress their wrongs. Persons who knew the colony spoke of the danger which might arise from a sudden and sweeping change ; but that mattered little in the estimate of these unflinching patriots. "Perish the colonies," replied Barnave, "rather than we should compromise one iota of our principles." A decree of the National Constituent Assembly in 1791 conferred accordingly on the free people of colour in the French colonies the unlimited enjoyment of all rights and privileges whatsoever possessed by French citizens.

In spite of their taste for modern ideas, the news of this decree excited only rage and astonishment in the breasts of the colonists. Many of them tore off and trampled on the tricolor cockade ; the royalist faction, which had been considerable, was suddenly swelled by a host of political con-

<sup>4</sup> M. Ardouin estimates the mulatto population at this time to have numbered nearly 40,000.

verts; and in the colonial assembly, which met at Cap Français in August, it was resolved never to yield to the levelling policy of the mother-country. The mulattoes, seeing this excitement and believing themselves in danger, began to assemble in bodies and to arm themselves. But before the civil war had actually commenced, it was merged in a social war, produced by a servile insurrection. Catching the infection of the excitement around them, the Negroes on the plantations which studded the rich plains south of the Cap rose upon their masters, and began to murder and pillage all before them. The excesses of "slaves broke loose" are proverbial; and when the cruelty, which is a besetting sin of the Negro nature, is taken into account, the horrid scenes of outrageous brutality, of which the unhappy planters and their families were the victims during the two months commencing on the 23d of August 1791, may be readily imagined. All the whites who succeeded in escaping took refuge in the large towns, from the walls of which they might contemplate, by day and night, the lurid smoke-clouds that arose from their burning villas and ruined farm-buildings. But two thousand whites, without distinction of sex or age, perished in the massacre; a thousand families were reduced at once to beggary; and the prosperity of the French colony, which had mainly depended on the number and completeness of its establishments for boiling and refining sugar, was exchanged for the comparative desolation which has ever since prevailed over it.

The struggles which convulsed the island during the five succeeding years are difficult to unravel, and possess little interest even when understood. The political and social edifice lay in ruins, and various parties, races, and nationalities were ferociously contending together for the possession of the site; but for a long time no overmastering force manifested itself any where, and the efforts that were made neutralised each other. The revolutionary government of the mother-country sent out commissioners from time to time, with full powers to act and decree; and two of these, Polverel and Sonthonax, —eloquent, fiery Jacobins of the Danton type, but with a certain honesty in their fanaticism which one cannot but respect,—being backed by six thousand French troops, obtained nearly complete command of the French part of the island in the early part of 1793. But difficulties, with which they were unable to grapple, soon thickened around them. Among the colonists there was a royalist party, which, though by itself it could have effected little, was backed by the sympathies and active aid of a large portion of the Negro



population, who had not forgotten the teaching of the missionaries in the old days, and were unable to comprehend the idea of a republic. Another, and the strongest, party among the whites simply desired the restitution of the *status quo ante*,—that the planters should be re-installed in their estates, and their old slaves again brought under the lash. Provided this object were gained, they did not care to what means they resorted; they were ready to give the colony up to any foreign power that would serve their purpose in this respect, whether it were Spain or England, especially as the disturbances in France forbade them to look for any reversal of the previous levelling policy from that quarter. A deputation from this party accordingly proceeded to Jamaica in 1793, and invoked the interference and protection of Great Britain. Small English expeditions were then sent to Jeremie and Molé St. Nicholas, places of strength situated at the extremities of the great western gulf, or bay of Port-au-Prince, and established their footing with little opposition. Further efforts were made in 1794, and all that the most conspicuous dash and gallantry could do was effected; even Port-au-Prince itself, the capital of the colony, fell into our hands. But the number of English troops that could be spared for this service was too small to conquer so large a country against the wish of the majority of the inhabitants. The mulattoes, almost to a man, sided with the French republic; even among the whites the foreign invaders met with far less support than had been promised; while by the black masses the English, who were then slave-holders and slave-traders, were naturally looked upon with suspicion. The leaders of the Negro insurrection of 1791, Jean François, Biassou, and others, had, after that event, crossed the frontier between the French and Spanish colonies, and, actuated by their loyalist and Catholic sympathies, had enlisted under the Spanish flag. War broke out between Spain and France in 1793; and in that and the following year these black legions conquered a considerable portion of the northern province for the king of Spain, while the English were pressing forward in the west and south. The cause of the French republic seemed well-nigh hopeless, when it was suddenly retrieved, and a decisive direction was given to the whole future of the colony, by the defection from the Spanish flag of the celebrated Toussaint.

Toussaint Bréda, born and reared on the estate of that name near Cap François, was taught to read and write, and obtained, in no inconsiderable degree, opportunities for self-culture, through the discriminating kindness of his master,

M. Bayou, the agent. Like most Negroes, he was innately religious, and was so well and thoroughly instructed in the Catholic faith by his confessor, that, whatever may have been the errors of his practice in later years, he was never in any danger, like some of the black potentates who succeeded him, of relapsing into or countenancing the debasing superstitions of his African kindred, which he ever scorned and put from him with all his heart. After providing for the safety of M. Bayou amidst the terrible scenes of the insurrection of 1791, Toussaint, with the other black chiefs already mentioned, crossed the frontier into the Spanish colony, and, entering the service of the King of Spain, there learnt the duties of a soldier. For some years he remained a passive, though profoundly interested spectator of the wild sea of confusion in which the late imposing fabric of Haytian prosperity had been engulfed. It is said that among the few books which fell in his way while he was still a slave was the Abbé Raynal's work on the history of the Antilles, in which occurs an eloquent passage predicting the appearance one day of a black deliverer to redress the wrongs of the slaves, and vindicate for them the rights and dignity of manhood. The idea thus suggested sank into the meditative mind of Toussaint, and certainly he himself did much for its realisation. While serving under Spanish colours, his plans seem to have reached no further than the rehabilitation of "the cause of God and of kings" in his own country, through Spanish aid; doubtless with the condition or consequence that all blacks who had fought for that consummation should be free. His mind at this early period was slow-moving, conscientious, true to facts; he was, without doubt, sincerely loyal and religious, and abhorred the Voltairian extravagances of revolutionary France, not the less, perhaps, because the new ideas were fashionable with the majority of the white colonists. For some time he met the overtures of the republican commissioners with a cold and steady denial; he was not the man to be driven or wheedled into a path where he did not see his way clearly. But he thought on and on; and gradually things grew clear to him. First came the weakness of Spain: he must have heard how the feeble Bourbon lay helpless in the strong gripe of the republic, and he saw that there was not much to be gained, either for himself or his race, by leaning on Spain. Then there was the desperate plight of French royalty; the king, *his* king, guillotined in Paris; Europe clamouring and threatening; and the republic turning sternly to bay against its multitudinous assailants. Such thoughts as these must have gradually



undermined his determination to stand or fall by "the cause of God and of kings;" the final impulse<sup>5</sup> came from a petty quarrel with General Biassou, his superior officer, in which Toussaint thought himself cavalierly treated by the Spanish authorities. In May 1794 he sent in his submission to Laveaux, then acting governor-general at Cap Français. His conduct on this occasion has been ascribed—but, as we shall show, erroneously—to the effect produced on him by the intelligence of the decree of the Convention in February 1794, declaring the abolition of Negro-slavery in all the French colonies.

From this date, as if by the introduction of a new and powerful element, we see the burning lava-field of Haytian revolution gradually cool and subside; the master-spirit has appeared who can bring order into the chaos. The ex-slave of Breda, who had his price in the market, and might have been scourged and branded by his master with impunity like a beast of burden, developes a genius for command, an insight into all the conditions of a most difficult problem in state-craft, a talent for organisation, and a patient, pertinacious energy, which few of the born rulers of men have surpassed. He shed blood, indeed, like water, or caused it to be shed, when it suited his purpose; but with such examples all around him, both on the French and the colonial stage, this is little to be wondered at. It is no less absurd to represent Toussaint Louverture in the light of a scrupulous, moral, unselfish philanthropist than to confound him with the vulgar black despots,—the Dessalines and Soulouques of later Haytian history. After having risen to a certain point, he came, like Napoleon, to believe in his own star; he convinced himself that he was the destined saviour of his country, the destined founder of her liberty and greatness,—and then, woe be to those who crossed his path. *Salus populi* became with him the *summa lex*; and that *salus* he easily identified with the preservation and extension of his own power. We must pass over very briefly the first steps of his ascent. From the day when he took service under the republican standard, he set to work to dislodge the English from the colony; it was a hard fight, and he met with many reverses in it; but he accomplished the feat at last, and in 1798 General Maitland agreed to the evacuation of the island. In 1796 he came opportunely to the rescue of Laveaux, who was contending against a mulatto insurrection; in gratitude for which Laveaux nominated him lieutenant-governor of the colony. In May 1797 he was nominated by Sonthonax,

<sup>5</sup> Ardouin, ii. 419.

who had returned to Hayti in the preceding year as chief agent of the Executive Directory, general-in-chief of the colonial armies. Two months later, feeling that he could manage matters much better without the interference of this restless, violent man, he compelled Sonthonax to embark for France; and then, using the name of Raymond, one of the inferior agents, to give a legal colour to his proceedings, he assumed the administration of affairs into his own hands. General Hédouville arrived early in 1798, as a successor to Sonthonax; but, by a mixture of firmness and duplicity, Toussaint contrived to paralyse his influence in the colony; and in October of that year compelled him also to take ship for France. The Directory did not relish these strong measures; but England had the command of the sea, and they could not then send an armed force sufficient to make their authority respected; they therefore put the best face they could upon the affair, and confirmed Toussaint in the rank of general-in-chief, to which he had been nominated by Sonthonax. Hédouville, before his departure, that he might leave an apple of discord behind him as a parting gift to his rival, appointed the mulatto General Rigaud to the government of the southern province. A war ensued between Rigaud and Toussaint, which soon degenerated into a war of caste between blacks and mulattoes; the usual horrid incidents of Haytian warfare—massacre, arson, pillage, and assassination—made their appearance; but in 1799, Toussaint drove his enemy within the fortifications of Les Cayes, a port on the southern coast, and blockaded him there; and in the following year Rigaud agreed to evacuate the place and the colony. Freed from domestic antagonism, Toussaint now turned his arms eastward; and leading an overwhelming Negro host into the Spanish colony, compelled the governor, Don Garcia, to carry out the terms of the treaty of Basil by yielding up his authority to him as the representative of France. Thus the whole island, for the first time since the days of the old Spanish domination, was united under one government; and Toussaint proceeded with extraordinary vigour and ability to those internal reforms by which he hoped to restore the former palmy days of the colony.

The measures which he took to this end were characterised by a wisdom and enlightenment truly marvellous. Disdaining the prejudices of colour, he surrounded his person and filled his administration with white men; he invited and entreated the exiled planters to return to the colony; and when they arrived, he reinstated them in the possession



of their properties. In this way he hoped both to appease the resentment which his high-handed behaviour had excited in France, and to obtain for the Negroes the benefit of continued contact with a race to which his own, in spite of a few remarkable exceptions, was, he well knew, immeasurably inferior. At a time when the policy of the most enlightened nations had not brought them beyond the commercial system in political economy, Toussaint established free-trade in Hayti, and opened her ports to the ships of all nations. An extraordinary impulse was thus given to commerce; and even the proud Spaniards of Santo Domingo, much as they chafed under the rule of their black neighbours, were forced to own that a prospect of material prosperity was opening before them, from which, under the jealous and restrictive government of Spain, they had always been debarred. His rural code—though its severity excites the indignation of M. Ardouin, whose constitutional purism demands that the Negro “citizen” should be left as free as the European to engage in the pursuit of happiness in his own way—shows how thoroughly he understood the natures with which he had to deal, and how little this ex-slave would have sympathised with the sentimental rhapsodies of our modern abolitionists. The blacks of Hayti were now nominally “free;” but, as Lacroix says, “ten of the new ostensibly free citizens, threatened with the inspection of General Dessalines, did more work, and cultivated better, than thirty slaves in the old times.” The system was simple. The whole island was divided into three military districts, that of the North, commanded by General Moyse; that of the West and South, commanded by Dessalines; and that of the East, by Clervaux. These generals were nominated inspectors-general of cultivation; and it was their duty to make their rounds among the estates of their respective districts, summarily punish any idleness or insubordination proved against the cultivators, and report the results of their inspection annually to the general-in-chief. If an estate appeared to be ill-cultivated, and the manager laid the blame upon the idleness of the cultivators generally, Dessalines used to have one of them selected by lot and hanged, *pour encourager les autres*. If an individual were pointed out to him as a mischief-maker or an idler, he would cause the unfortunate wretch to be buried alive in the presence of his assembled fellow-labourers. The only freedom of action reserved to the cultivator consisted in the privilege of removing to a new plantation at the end of a year, if he desired it. In lieu of wages, a fourth of the raw produce of the estate was assigned to its staff of

cultivators. Under such a pressure, no wonder if the production of sugar greatly increased, and bid fair to equal, in a few years, the amount exported before the revolution. Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that this severity made Toussaint unpopular with the people of his colour. On the contrary, the enthusiastic devotion which he inspired was universal; and it was illustrated in a singular manner after the riot which led to the execution of Moyse, when Toussaint paraded the troops of the northern garrisons, and singling out a few Negroes who had been prominent in the business, ordered them to go and "have themselves shot" (*se faire fusiller*). Without a murmur or an entreaty—with joined hands and penitent, reverential looks—the culprits obeyed the mandate, and presented themselves to receive the fatal volley.

As to his own position, Toussaint took care to improve that, so far as the means at his disposal would allow. He marked with deep admiring interest the expanding genius and fortune of Napoleon, and was fond of hearing himself compared to him; he wrote frequently to the First Consul, and is said to have superscribed some of his letters, "The First of Blacks to the First of Whites." He said to Vincent in 1801, that "he was the Bonaparte of St. Domingo, and the colony could no longer exist without him." Being therefore already a virtual necessity, why should he not be a recognised and admitted necessity also? Accordingly, after his triumphant return from receiving the submission of the Spanish colony in 1801, he contrived that a constituent body should meet, which took the name of the "Central Assembly," and after a short deliberation presented for his adoption the project of a colonial constitution, which concentrated all the powers of government in his hands, and named him governor and president for life, with the right of choosing his successor, and appointing to all offices. Some of his friends protested against a measure which, they argued, was an invasion of the rights of France; but Toussaint confirmed it, and put every engine in motion to obtain its ratification by the home government.

The later history of Hayti might have been very different had this great ruler been permitted to carry on his mission of reform and reconstruction to the end. But Toussaint's ambition hurtled against an ambition not less intolerant and aspiring than his own, and backed by incomparably greater resources: he fell; but with his dying hand he pulled down the whole colonial fabric in ruins over his head. Bonaparte admitted at St. Helena that, in send-



ing an army to reduce St. Domingo, he had committed a great error ; he ought, he said, to have recognised Toussaint's authority, and frankly committed French interests there to his keeping. But when, in 1801, the Peace of Amiens left the seas open to the fleets of France, the First Consul was beset by exiled planters, rancorous agents, and the slaveholding interest in general, all urging him to restore the old state of things. Josephine's family was connected with the planter aristocracy, which again partly belonged to, and had considerable influence with, the old *noblesse*, which it was Napoleon's object at the time to conciliate. This, together with a certain spirit of reaction against the Utopias of the Jacobins, and the contempt which he felt for the talkative and fussy "Amis des Noirs," determined the First Consul to send out a powerful expedition to restore French ascendancy in the colony.

Did he intend to reëstablish the old system of slavery ? Ostensibly not ; the proclamation distributed upon the arrival of the expedition opened with these words : " Whatever may be your origin and your colour, you are all Frenchmen ; you are all free, and all equal before God and before men." Napoleon's remarkable letter to Toussaint contained declarations equally explicit. But, in the secret instructions furnished to Leclerc, the general commanding the expedition, there was—as Lacroix pretty clearly intimates—a clause directing him to reëstablish slavery as soon as he should have obtained military command of the colony. This intention could not be kept absolutely secret ; and numerous private letters had reached the island before the arrival of the armament, announcing the real purpose for which it was to be employed. Again, in contravention of the decree of February 1794, slavery had been restored at Martinique and Guadaloupe. It was natural that, being aware of all these facts, Toussaint should put no faith in the proclamations and professions of the First Consul, and should excite his people to a stubborn resistance against those who came to reduce them again to bondage.

The fleet, conveying General Leclerc and an army of 12,000 men, arrived before Cap Français on the 2d February 1802. Into the complicated military operations which followed, it is not our purpose to enter. The line of conduct enjoined by Toussaint upon all his officers was summed up in two words, "*bruler et fuir*." The gloomy autocrat had resolved that, if the charge of the destinies of the colony were forced from his hands, he would first destroy the prosperity which he had created. In pursuance of this policy, which

anticipated the stern resolution that gave Moscow to the flames, the towns of Cap Français and St. Marc were deliberately set on fire under the direction of Christophe and Dessalines; and it was only the rapid onset of the French that saved Port-au-Prince from a similar fate. But the first attack of the veterans of Marengo was irresistible; Toussaint was defeated in several engagements; and these reverses, together with the effect produced by the assiduous circulation of the First Consul's proclamation, carried dismay and hesitation into the breasts of the black officers, who would have scrupled to draw their swords against the mother-country, could they have become convinced that she had no designs upon their liberty. First Christophe, and then Dessalines, came in and made their submission to Leclerc; Toussaint himself then despaired of the issue, and expressed a desire to treat. It was arranged that he should retire to one of his estates; he did so; but soon after he was treacherously seized by order of Leclerc, and placed as a prisoner on board a vessel sailing for France. Upon his arrival, he was, as all the world knows, sent to the fort of Joux,—a castle situated in a damp cold valley of the Jura chain; and here, to the eternal infamy of Napoleon, he literally, in a few months, perished of cold and starvation.

The estimate we have been led to form of the character of this great man may be pretty well inferred from the sketch that we have drawn of his career. In connection with this topic, however, a remarkable book, the work of a justly-celebrated woman, presents itself for our consideration. In her novel of *The Hour and the Man*, Miss Martineau has drawn, with a skilful and vigorous hand, the portrait of Toussaint Louverture, in the character of the typical Negro, the redeemer of his race, and the victim of the jealous cruelty of the whites. Her Toussaint, like Spenser's Prince Arthur, unites in his own person the characteristic points of the twelve moral virtues. Profoundly impressed from his earliest years with the truths of religion, he only revolts against the authority of his spiritual guides when, and in so far as, to hearken to them would be to commit treason against the liberties of his race. Reared under a tropical sun, and with the sensual African blood boiling in his veins, her hero is not only the kindest and tenderest of fathers, but the most faithful and faultless of husbands. While the constant cry of all the raging factions among which his life is spent is for blood and vengeance, he alone inscribes upon his banner the words, "No retaliation;" and if he can ever bring himself to order an execution, it is when, with the stern justice of the



Roman Brutus, he causes his own nephew to be shot for having failed to repress an outbreak which resulted in the murder of several whites. In a word, he is wholly unselfish, morality pure and simple; and, while dying of cold and hunger in the prison of Joux, he forgets his pangs in the rapturous contemplation of the brilliant future, founded on his sacrifices, which he sees in spirit reserved for the Negro race.

It is an ungracious task to dispel illusions which please, and to expose the shortcomings of imagined paragons; but the truth of history must not be warped to support a particular system or opinion, however humane or enlightened. Miss Martineau, writing as an abolitionist, proposed to herself to paint the black hero of St. Domingo in such colours as would not only extort from European readers the acknowledgment of his genius, but also enchain their moral sympathies by the spectacle of so much purity, generosity, and unselfish goodness; and it was necessary to represent him as having devoted his whole energies, and at last sacrificed life itself, to the cause of Negro emancipation. For a twofold inference was suggested by this picture in favour of the cause of abolition: first, that the race which white men presume to enslave is capable of producing specimens of sublime and unsurpassed virtue; secondly, that these distinguished types of African nationality hold exactly the same notions about Negro slavery as the abolitionists do. We do not insinuate for a moment that Miss Martineau consciously misrepresented the facts before her; but we do think that the strength of her feelings about slavery led her to interpret in one way all the existing notices of Toussaint's character and career. Upon slight data she formed an ideal in her own mind, and then measured the worth and veracity of the authors who had written about her hero by the degree in which they bore her out. Upon what other hypothesis can we explain her partiality for such authorities as Rainsford and the Haytian papers, contrasted with her disregard of the statements of Pamphile de Lacroix, a man of high honour, who had no motive to deceive, and was himself an actor in many of the scenes which he relates?

But whether this be the correct explanation or not, it is certain that the Toussaint of history was a very different personage from the hero of *The Hour and the Man*. The Toussaint of the romance is profoundly and sincerely religious. The Toussaint of history was thought so by many, until the event undeceived them. The Marquis d'Hermona, under whose orders he was just before he deserted the Spanish flag, is said

to have cried out, on seeing Toussaint receive the communion, "No ; God in this lower world could not visit a soul more pure !" A few days later he was stupefied by the intelligence that his devout subordinate had gone over to the French with the troops under his command, and was cutting off all the Spanish posts that he could surprise. Lacroix relates that Leclerc was instructed by Napoleon to offer a mitre to any one of Toussaint's confessors who could induce him to make a voluntary submission ; but that they one and all declared that they had not the slightest influence over the resolutions of their pretended penitent, with whom, they said, religion was but a politic mask.

Again, the Toussaint of the romance is every thing that is exemplary in private life. Of the Toussaint of history the following curious story is told by Lacroix (ii. 104), and admitted by Ardouin. The incident occurred just after the taking of Port-au-Prince by the French in February 1802. "We were examining with General Boudet the secret documents of Toussaint Louverture. Our curiosity had just been increased by the discovery of a false bottom in the box which contained them. Let the reader judge of our astonishment when, on breaking through this false bottom, we found in the cavity nothing but locks of hair of all colours, rings, gold hearts pierced by arrows, little keys, souvenirs, and an innumerable assortment of *billets-doux*, which left no doubt as to the successes obtained in love by the old Toussaint. Yet he was black, and of a repulsive exterior ; but he had made himself the dispenser of all fortunes, and his power could change at will all conditions."

The Toussaint of the romance is eminently humane and merciful ; his motto is "No retaliation." The Toussaint of history, though he seldom liked to appear as the immediate causer of bloodshed, can be proved to have massacred thousands by deputy ; he did not shun the thing, but the infamy arising from it. Miss Martineau has worked up with great effect the incident of the execution of Moyse, sacrificed to the stern justice of his uncle for not having been more careful of the safety of the whites. But she is silent respecting the massacre of two hundred whites—men, women, and children—by Dessalines at St. Marc, of eight hundred at Verrettes, and hundreds more at other places ; massacres in which it is impossible not to suppose that Dessalines was merely carrying out the secret instructions of Toussaint Louverture, who was not the man to allow his lieutenants to take such decisive measures upon their own authority. But this was after the landing of the French expedition, when, since cle-



mency would serve his ambition no longer, Toussaint had determined to burn, kill, destroy, and confound every thing,—to “pour the sweet milk of concord into hell,” sooner than let Leclerc march quietly in, and take possession of the edifice which he had raised at the cost of so much toil and blood. Vollée, his administrator-general of finance, who had served under him for years, and used to prepare his estimates for submission to the central assembly, was at this time, according to Lacroix, “shot almost before his eyes,” that with him might be buried the knowledge of all his resources.

This analysis might be carried considerably farther; particularly so as to show that Miss Martineau is completely mistaken in ascribing Toussaint’s transference of his services to the French camp, in 1794, to the decree of the Convention declaring the abolition of slavery. But enough has been said to show that the character of Toussaint, though one of undeniable greatness, is not exactly of such a nature as to suit the views of the anti-slavery society. Had it been so, it would, in one respect, have been less great. Had he applied European ideas to Haytian circumstances, and given to his countrymen the same kind of emancipation as the abolitionists obtained for the slaves in our West-Indian colonies, he would simply have reduced Hayti to the state of material ruin and moral stagnation which emancipation has brought about in Jamaica. But he knew that to give to the Negro the right of disposing of himself and his own activity, uncontrolled, was in most cases, considering the actual moral and intellectual development of the race, to make him a worthless, lazy sensualist. He therefore consulted wisely and humanely for the permanent interest of his people, by binding them to compulsory labour, at the same time that he secured to them some of the most important personal rights of freemen. In short, he seems to have regarded Negro slavery nearly in the same way as the authors of the Spanish slave-code must have regarded it—as a means of race-education, as an indispensable stage in the progress of the Negro to the entire freedom of the rational civilised man. He was even anxious to re-open the African slave-trade, in order to keep up a constant supply of labour for the plantations.

In few words, this phenomenon of Toussaint Louverture may be thus described. His bravery, firmness, energy, political insight, and administrative capacity, were such as have been rarely displayed by the greatest rulers. But, once

engaged on the perilous ascent of power, he let ambition sear his conscience, and scrupled at no crime which would serve his turn. His fall, therefore, may be regarded as a just and memorable retribution, however cruel and iniquitous were the means employed to bring it about.

We now resume the thread of the narrative. Leclerc seemed to have crushed all opposition, and the colony was beginning to wear a quiet appearance, when the terrible yellow fever broke out among the French troops. Its ravages soon became known, and encouraged the blacks to new risings under various obscure leaders. Reinforcements were poured in from France; but as fast as they arrived, the majority of the men were prostrated by sickness. Seeing how the climate fought for them, the black chiefs, Christophe and Dessalines, and the coloured generals Clervaux and Petion, escaped from the French lines, and put themselves at the head of the insurgents. Leclerc was struck down by the fever in November 1802, deploring on his death-bed, according to Lacroix, "an enterprise made upon men, and by men, worthy of a better fate, on account of the services which they had already rendered, and might still render, to France." But these regrets came too late; the command of the remnant of the French army passed into the hands of General Rochambeau, and the war thenceforward assumed a character of frightful ferocity. In a moment of panic, twelve hundred black soldiers, confined on board the French fleet, were made the victims of a *noyade*. But all was in vain; pestilence still continued to sweep off the reinforcements; and Lacroix calculates that, even before the death of Leclerc, 24,000 French soldiers had perished. Before the end of 1803, France and England were again at war; the sea was closed against the French flag, and that which had been a losing became a hopeless enterprise. Cap Français, the last foothold of the expedition, was evacuated in November 1803; and the garrison had no alternative but to surrender themselves prisoners of war to an English squadron.

On the 29th of November 1803 the triumphant black chieftains proclaimed the independence of Hayti; and at the commencement of the next year Dessalines was elected by his brother officers governor-general for life, with the power to legislate, and to choose his successor. The first proclamations of the new ruler breathed nothing but clemency and condonation; he even invited the exiled planters to return, on the promise of reinstating them in their possessions. But when many of them had returned on the faith of this promise, Des-



salines threw off the mask, and ordered a general massacre of the white population of French descent, himself acting as an executioner to animate his soldiers to the bloody work.

Here ends the first epoch of the Haytian revolution, in the utter extermination of the French colonists, by whose energy and intelligence the island wildernesses had been transformed into a peopled and productive garden. That the vices and cruelty of the class had merited their doom may perhaps be true; but it is not the less evident that a want of common sense was the original cause of the catastrophe. Bryan Edwards declares that the slaves were no worse treated in Hayti than in the English colonies; and it is certain that they were better off than the slaves are at this day in the Confederate States. But the reckless importation of Negroes till their numbers rose to a dangerous disproportion to those of the whites, the oppression exercised towards the mulattoes, and the capricious rather than harsh administration of the slave-code,—combined to produce an insecure state of things, which the revolution at home precipitated into a general overthrow of society.

After the massacre, it was solemnly decreed that no white man should for the future be allowed to obtain the Haytian citizenship, nor be competent to acquire landed property. In every subsequent revolution this fundamental enactment has been adhered to.

Toussaint has been accused of a childish vanity, and of a propensity to imitation, common in the Negro, which made his government a parody of the First Consul's court. It is remarkable that the establishment of the empire in Hayti preceded that of France by two months. Dessalines was crowned on the 8th of October 1804. Under the new imperial constitution, the Catholic Church was disconnected from the state, which thenceforth undertook to tolerate all religions impartially. But the voluntary principle did not, as may be imagined, succeed in Hayti. The mulattoes were Voltairian and rationalist, and the new arrangement exactly harmonised with their wishes; but the Negroes, having little or no power of origination, when Christianity was no longer brought to them by their rulers did not go to seek for it, but relapsed into a state of religious vacancy, which ended in the seven devils of Fetishism and African superstition. The worship of the Congo-adder, the mysterious Vaudoux, was the special form taken by the growing idolatry; and the evil, in the absence of correctives from without, owing to the political isolation of Hayti, grew worse and worse, until of late years we have even heard of the same individual, the

notorious Friar Joseph, pretending to unite the characters of a Christian priest and a Vaudoux sorcerer.

In October 1806, Dessalines, whose insatiable ferocity threatened to become dangerous even to the blacks, was shot by his own troops. The mutineers offered the supreme power to Christophe, who was then the general commanding at Cap Français. A constituent assembly, in which mulatto influence was predominant, met at Port-au-Prince, the capital of the Western province; in December, it promulgated a new constitution, in which Hayti was declared a republic, and Christophe nominated president, but with carefully limited powers. Resenting the limitations, Christophe marched an army into the Western province, with a view, as he said, "to restore order at Port-au-Prince." The constitutional party, led by Petion and other mulattoes, opposed him, and though defeated in the field successfully defended Port-au-Prince. Upon his retirement from before its walls, the assembly, in January 1807, decreed his deposition, and appointed Alexandre Petion president for four years. Christophe, on his part, convoked a constituent assembly at Cap Français; and this obsequious body immediately nominated him president and generalissimo of the state of Hayti for life, and issued another "constitution," conferring on him almost kingly powers.

French Hayti was thus divided into two independent states nearly equal in extent: the northern half, with Cap Français for its capital, being the state (and, soon after, the kingdom) of Hayti, under the rule of Christophe; the southern half, with Port-au-Prince for its capital, calling itself the Republic of Hayti, under the presidency of Petion. Mulatto influence predominated at the south, Negro influence at the north. War ensued between the two states thus founded, and was carried on with varying success for several years. It ceased at last, rather owing to the exhaustion of the combatants than from any abatement of their mutual animosity; and a broad strip of frontier land, nearly twenty miles in width, was by common consent suffered to remain untilled between the two countries, and soon became, through the rapid growth of tropical vegetation, a tangled impassable forest. The history of the southern republic presents no event of much interest for many years. Petion's power was renewed from time to time; and in 1816 he established a constitution, which actually remained intact for twenty-seven years, until the departure of Boyer in 1843. The new institutions were framed partly on the English, partly on the American model. There was a Senate, and a House of Com-



mons, both elective; the machinery of government and legislation was managed nearly as in the United States. At the same time, the civilisation and ideas of the cultivated classes remained wholly French. Petion, who seems to have been an honest man and a real lover of liberty, died at the age of forty-eight, in 1818, not—as has been commonly reported—from the effects of voluntary abstinence from food caused by a philosophical disgust of life, but from physical exhaustion supervening on a long and harassing illness.<sup>6</sup> Petion's territorial policy aimed at the establishment of a numerous class of small landed proprietors, by the subdivision both of the public lands and of many of the estates belonging to the exiled planters. In this way, though the number seems incredible, he is said to have created upwards of 100,000 freehold properties, the owners of which were all interested in the maintenance of the Republic, and in resisting any future French invasion. But Petion had not foreseen, and he deeply deplored, the collapse of productive industry which resulted from this measure. The cultivation, not only of sugar, but of cotton and even of coffee, gradually declined and came to nothing. The new proprietor, with true African thoughtlessness, planted his half-dozen banana-trees, which as soon as they grew up insured him a plentiful subsistence, and then abandoned himself to the delights of idleness,—dancing, fiddling, chatting, laughing, and basking in the glorious sunshine of the tropics.

In the northern state every thing went differently. Christophe, like a true Negro, could not long resist the temptation of having his ears tickled by the words "your majesty," and encircling his woolly head with a real golden crown. Accordingly, in March 1811, he caused himself to be crowned king by the name of Henry I. "But what is a king without an hereditary aristocracy to support the throne?" sagely argued Christophe; and he proceeded at once to manufacture an aristocracy. He had little choice of materials, it must be confessed. Again reasoned the monarch, "The masses must be taught religion, because it is one of the chief conservative elements in society;" so he created a batch of spiritual lords, an archbishop and three bishops. History has forgotten the titles of their sees, and the more readily, because the Holy See did not see its way to the confirmation of this magnificent arrangement. The royal "Order of St. Henry," with grand crosses, commanders, &c. in due proportions, was another of Christophe's brilliant inventions.

The territorial system, established under King Henry in

<sup>6</sup> Ardouin, viii. 320.

northern Hayti, was, in relation to the cultivators, yet more rigorous than that of Toussaint had been. With considerable ingenuity Christophe planned and carried out a sort of feudal system, under which the nobles whom he had created were put in possession of enormous estates as vassals of the crown, and, instead of rendering the old feudal services or paying rents, were required to feed, clothe, and pay, each according to the extent of his property, a certain number of the soldiers of the army, who on their part had to perform the duties of a rural police. Each feudal lord had rights of jurisdiction on his own manor; and idleness on the part of the cultivators was accounted a punishable crime; even the penalty of death might be adjudged and inflicted by the lord. Agriculture and commerce thus flourished in the north to a far greater extent than in the apparently, and, so far as the mulattoes were concerned, really, more civilised republic of the south.

Pétion, having the right of choosing his successor, nominated before his death his old friend and companion-in-arms, General Boyer, a man of colour, to the vacant presidential chair. Two years afterwards a sudden turn of fortune raised the new president to a position of greatly augmented power and dignity; for in 1820 the dazzling edifice which Christophe had reared was shivered to pieces. A regiment, quartered at St. Marc, mutinied; the detachments sent to quell the revolt one after the other pronounced for it. Christophe, too ill to take the field himself, then sent forth his body-guard, to whom the desperate savage promised the plunder of Cap Français, if they should come back victorious over the mutineers. The guard shouted, "Vive Henri I!" and marched out; but when they met the enemy, they argued, with that comical Negro logic which M. Gustave d'Alaux analyses with such infinite humour, that it would be easier and more pleasant to sack the royal palace than to attack a city where they would probably meet with a stiff resistance. So the guard also joined the insurgents. Christophe, upon hearing of this last defection, bade a calm farewell to the members of his family, and shot himself through the head. Boyer took advantage of the confusion which ensued, marched in with an army, and, meeting with little opposition, caused himself to be proclaimed president of the entire country of French Hayti.

Twenty-three comparatively uneventful years followed. In 1821 Boyer succeeded in effecting the reunion of Spanish Hayti, under circumstances presently to be described, and thus united the whole island under one government. Pétion's



constitution worked indifferently well. The senators and representatives debated most eloquently, and fenced at each other with the most approved weapons of parliamentary warfare, — discussing “the question whether this question should be put,” as Carlyle says, and other equally important matters; but we do not find that any practical good came of it. Little did those poor mulatto orators, engrossed by their political formulas, full of eagerness, versatility, and intelligence, suspect what an abyss yawned beneath their feet, and would one day swallow them up! Poor frantic men, who did not know when they were well off, but overturned Petion’s constitution because it was not democratic enough for them, and in so doing unchained a monster worse than the red republic, namely, the black empire, which immolated them to socialism and the Congo-adder!

Boyer’s great political feat was the negotiation of a treaty with the government of Charles X. in 1825, by which France agreed to recognise the independence of Hayti on condition of the payment of a sum of money equal to six millions sterling, as compensation to the dispossessed planters or their representatives. Yet inconceivable trouble and annoyance have arisen out of the arrangement, and, in a measure, subsist to this day, owing to the difficulty experienced by successive Haytian governments, in the ruined state of all the more productive branches of industry, in raising the necessary funds to meet the instalments as they became due. At present one-half of the receipts from the customs and harbour-dues in all the ports of French Hayti is paid over to France in liquidation of the debt; nevertheless it seems that a large portion of it is still outstanding. With regard to agriculture, Boyer had no choice at first but to continue the system of Petion in the south and west, and even to extend it to the north, where he would not have succeeded so well, had not the cultivators regarded his coming as the signal for the downfall of the feudal and industrial organisation established by Christophe. After France had recognised the Republic, he did issue a rural code, with the object of compelling the general labouring population to work on the plantations, under regulations little less severe than those of Toussaint. But though Negroes will submit to almost any amount of oppression from a chieftain of their own colour, the case is different with a mulatto ruler; and after several partial risings had taken place, Boyer, in his dread of exciting the jealousy of race, allowed the code to remain in great measure inoperative.

Towards the end of Boyer’s rule, he had on several

occasions come into serious collision with the legislative body ; and in 1843 the mulattoes of the south, instigated by the leading opposition members in the assembly, set on foot the most stupid and senseless revolution that history records. Their programme was ultra-democratic, and its chief features were borrowed from the United States constitution. The conspirators set a mulatto named Hérard Rivière at their head, whom they pompously entitled " Chef d'Exécution des Volontés du Peuple Souverain." Colonel Fabre Geffrard, then a young and ambitious man, took part with the insurgents, and his personal popularity in the army did them essential service. The usual amount of base and cowardly desertion took place among the troops sent to suppress the movement. But Boyer fell with honour. He was old and weary, and preferred resigning his power to keeping it at the cost of civil war. He accepted the offer of the English consul to place an English sloop-of-war, the *Scylla*, at his disposal. On leaving the palace, he said, with a sarcastic allusion to the manifesto of the insurgents : " I quit the country without regret, and leave it in the hands of those who propose to *regenerate* it." This honest ruler, whom the insurgents falsely accused of having squandered and embezzled the public money, left 250,000*l.* in the treasury, besides funds in the hands of agents in France ; his private fortune did not exceed 5000*l.*

The first consequence of the revolution was the revolt of Spanish Hayti. Hérard Rivière was ignominiously beaten in the attempt to suppress it ; and, being universally abused on his return home, and abandoned by his troops, he disappears from the scene. Three brief presidential terms succeed. General Guerrier, a Negro, was elected in May 1844 ; but died at the beginning of the following year. General Pierrot, also a Negro, succeeded him : he was an ignorant uneducated savage ; and a bloodless revolution unseated him at the end of a few months. The black General Riché, a man of probity and intelligence, came next ; unfortunately he died before the close of his first year of office. Not four years since Boyer's abdication, and already four presidents ! The senate debated long upon whom their choice should fall, neither of the two candidates who presented themselves appearing perfectly eligible. At last M. Ardouin, the historian, then president of the senate, proposed, by way of compromise, the name of General Faustin Soulouque, commander of the palace-guard. The senate adopted the proposal ; and Soulouque was elected, 1st March 1847.

The new president was a Negro, old, ignorant, super-



stitious, and, as was supposed, of not more than average ability; probably the mulatto senators imagined that he would be a pliant tool in their hands. If so, they reckoned without their host. At first, all went well; Soulouque introduced several liberal measures, and, among others, a plan for relaxing the law which prohibited the naturalisation of foreigners. But he was haunted by the thought that not one of the four presidents who had succeeded Boyer had seen the end of his first year of office. Soulouque was nominally a Catholic; but his religious education had been, to use a mild term, neglected; and the deity that he really believed in was the Vaudoux. He summoned to Port-au-Prince the principal black conjurors and sorcerers of the island, and required them to discover the magic spell which had cut short the thread of four presidential lives. After performing the necessary incantations, the sorcerers gravely announced that *Boyer, before his departure, had buried a fetish in the palace-garden, by the power of which no succeeding president had reached his thirteenth month of office.* Instantly, the soil of the garden was dug and turned over in every direction, and a series of expiatory solemnities was commenced, calculated to restrain or nullify the power of the fetish.

It may be imagined with what intense amusement, with what mockery and derision, the mulattoes of Port-au-Prince, with their Voltairian ideas and European culture, watched and commented on these vagaries of the president. They thought him a besotted fool, and talked openly of deposing him. Their jeers and comments were reported to Soulouque, and wrought in his dark and narrow soul a marvellous change. He began to hate the mulattoes with a terrific hatred, and gradually worked himself into the belief that the whole class were banded together in a conspiracy to hurl him from power. He resolved to be beforehand with them. After secretly ascertaining that his black troops would stand by him, Soulouque, on Sunday the 16th April 1848,—after sending word to the French consul that “he need not trouble himself about the safety of his countrymen; what was about to happen was only a *family scene*,”—commenced the work of vengeance. The massacre began in the palace, where the guards opened fire on the unsuspecting ministers and state-officers who were attending the president’s levée; it then spread to the streets and houses, and raged for three days and nights without intermission. But for the energetic remonstrances of the foreign consuls, not a mulatto in Port-au-Prince would have been left alive. Similar scenes were

enacted in the provinces; everywhere the black masses rose upon the unhappy mulattoes, and murdered them, sparing, however, in most cases the women and children. Soulouque himself made a progress through the south, and his presence was marked by military executions, of which the men of the doomed race were the victims. We have found no estimate of the total number of mulattoes who fell in this massacre; but the tenor of the accounts is inconsistent with a number less than many thousands. Upon the president's return to Port-au-Prince the trembling inhabitants, including the senate and assembly, hastened to crawl and lick the dust at his feet, and in their servile addresses attributed to "the blessed influence of his wise and moderate government" "the salvation of the country and the constitution."

Next year the loathsome farce of the establishment of a second empire was exhibited. As the grapeshot on the Boulevards ushered in the empire of Napoleon III., so the massacre of the mulattoes paved the way for the empire of Faustin I. The historical parallel is curiously exact; but we cannot deny the merit of originality to Soulouque, for his *coup d'état* preceded by two years that of the 2d December. He was crowned on the 26th August 1849, and reigned despotically nine years. The rogueries, cruelties, and villanies of every description perpetrated by this Nero of the minor theatres, would fill a thick pamphlet; if the reader cares to know the particulars, we refer him to the humorous narrative of M. Gustave d'Alaux, who fortunately, or unfortunately, was a resident in Hayti during part of the time. Another black nobility, still more numerous than that of Christophe, was called into existence; the nobles of the old *régime* resumed their august titles, and were joined by their equally august brethren of the later creation, the Count No. 2 and the Baron Harlequin. It is needless to add that cultivation, commerce, roads, public works, education, in short every branch and feature of modern civilisation, fell into decay, and were paralysed by neglect during this miserable time.

In this barbaric, blood-cemented Negro empire we see the final result of the experiment of making the Negroes independent, and leaving them free to develop a civilisation for themselves. A relapse after fifty years into something like African barbarism is the result. For the French Hayti of 1790, with its Christian population, its productive and coördinated industry, we have the Negro Hayti of 1850, with a population worshipping the Vaudoux, and vegetating in a lazy, sensual, unprofitable existence. We have not con-



cealed the defects of the Code Noir, nor the more serious abuses in its administration; yet surely Hayti, under its former masters, was a less hateful and grievous spectacle in the eye of Heaven and of reasoning men, than Hayti under Faustin I. Had the experiment been interrupted by no disturbing element, there seems no ground for supposing that any improvement would have occurred to this day. But though the whites had been exterminated, and the mulattoes fearfully reduced in numbers, yet enough of these last remained to do credit to the European blood which ran in their veins, and to assert once more the supremacy of reason over brute force.

The latest revolution in French Hayti commenced in December 1858. The appearance of the great comet in the autumn had prepared the minds of the black masses for political changes; and when a rising was reported at Gonaives, a small town some miles to the north of Port-au-Prince, they at once, with ready fatalism, acquiesced in the idea of its success. The insurgents found exactly the right man for their leader in the mulatto Fabre Geffrard, the same man who had borne a prominent part in the revolution of 1843. Soulouque's troops, whom he had latterly ill-treated and half-starved, turned against him almost to a man; and there was nothing left for the emperor to do but to decamp. M. Gustave d'Alaux has drawn most graphic and amusing sketches of the ridiculous spectacle presented by the procession of the imperial family and suite, lugging along with them a host of trunks and bandboxes, on their departure from the palace; of Soulouque's frenzied, fussy solicitude for the safe removal of his "shiny trunk," supposed to contain the crown-jewels; and of his arrival at Jamaica, and reception by the canaille at Kingston. As soon as Geffrard had the reins of government firmly in his hands, the Republic was proclaimed (Jan. 1859), and he was elected president. All the accounts since received from the island bear testimony to the prudent, moderate, and enlightened character of his administration. A considerable number of free mulattoes have lately emigrated to Hayti from the United States, and have commenced the cultivation of cotton. For their own sake, for the sake of their adopted country, and of our Lancashire operatives, let us earnestly hope that they will be successful. The soil and climate of Hayti are, we believe, precisely suited to the cotton-plant; and the great facilities which exist in most parts of the island for irrigation place it much more nearly on a level with the famous Sea Islands of the Carolinas than Jamaica can pretend to be; yet, by the

latest accounts, we hear of cotton-culture being actively and hopefully prosecuted in Jamaica. The official returns show an increase of one-third in the value of the export of British goods to Hayti during the first six months of 1862 as compared with the corresponding period of 1861. Probably this represents a similar improvement in the export-trade. Yet in spite of these promising indications, it must not be forgotten that society in French Hayti rests upon a slumbering volcano. It was but a few months ago that the newspapers reported the detection of a conspiracy against President Geffrard, for which fourteen persons had paid the penalty of their lives. The immense numerical preponderance of the blacks is in itself a standing menace of a social revolution. If the mulatto government is wise, it will repeal the constitutional proviso, which, ever since the time of Dessalines, has prohibited the naturalisation of white men. White immigrants would, in any future struggle, be the natural allies of the educated and civilised mulattoes; nor need the latter fear their rivalry, since the firm hold which they possess on the country, and the greater adaptation of their physical constitution to the extreme heat of the climate, are advantages in the race for power, which no amount of white immigration would be able to overbalance.

The course of history in the eastern part of the island is interesting, chiefly for the illustration it affords of the indestructibility of Spanish nationality, and of the recent astonishing growth of Spain in all the elements of power. We have made only incidental allusion to the progress of events in Spanish Hayti since the period of its annexation by Toussaint. When the expedition under Leclerc arrived in 1802, the Dominicans (to use a convenient designation which will comprise the Spanish creoles, the free people of colour, and the slaves, forming the population of eastern Hayti) welcomed the division of General Kerverseau on its approach to Santo Domingo; any rule was preferable in their eyes to that of the hated Negro. Kerverseau, and after him General Ferrand, held this portion of the island for France for several years after the expulsion of the French from western Hayti. But the hearts of the colonists never ceased to yearn after reunion with the grand old mother-country, which had been forced to part from them; their Castilian pride was hurt by the exclusive appointment of Frenchmen to state-offices, and their Castilian devotion was scandalised by the irreligious flippancy of these officials; so that, when war broke out between France and Spain in 1808, the Dominicans were glad



to seize the opportunity to revolt, and in the following year succeeded in expelling the French authorities from their confines. This restoration of Spanish rule was legalised by the Treaty of Paris in 1814. When the colonies on the Spanish main shook off, in 1821, the enfeebled grasp of the mother-country, the Dominicans commenced a similar movement, and declared themselves independent. But in 1822 Boyer marched at the head of an army upon Santo Domingo, and, taking advantage of the confusion that prevailed, succeeded in enforcing the recognition of his authority, and in reuniting both parts of the island. Twenty years of political torpor and discontent followed; the rule of the Negro state was oppressive and unjust; trade, industry, and population, all declined under it; and the inhabitants of Spanish Hayti, who in 1821 were reckoned at 125,000, numbered in 1843 only 85,000 souls.

Dominican deputies sat in the constituent assembly which was convoked at Port-au-Prince after the fall of Boyer; but the proceedings of the majority aroused their deep displeasure. The new constitution, they complained, placed "their mother-tongue, the last relic of Spanish nationality," at a disadvantage as compared with French; and it degraded the Catholic Church from its position as the Church of the state. "If," they said, "our holy religion, even while it was still the state-religion, was despised and oppressed both in itself and in its ministers, what has it now to expect when surrounded by sectaries and foes?" The deputies, despairing of obtaining effectual protection from Spain in her then powerless condition, secretly proposed to the French consul to place their country under a French protectorate. The offer was refused; nevertheless, the resolution to shake off the detested Negro rule had now spread through the whole country, and a bold and dignified manifesto appeared at Santo Domingo in February 1844, declaring the political independence of Spanish Hayti, under the name of the Dominican Republic. General Hérard Rivière, as has been already mentioned, immediately led a black army of 20,000 men across the borders, and penetrated as far as Azua. At this crisis of their destiny, a hero arose among the Dominicans, whose feats of splendid valour recalled the days of Cortez, and who planted on a safe and solid basis of victorious achievement the independence which so far had existed only in proclamations.

This man was Don Pedro Santana. He was a white of pure Spanish blood, and the owner of a large cattle-station on the peninsula of Seybo. Like David, he left his flocks and herds in the wilderness, and followed by not more than

1500 horsemen, mostly shepherds, with the war-cry *Viva la Virgen Maria!* marched to encounter the black Philistines. Without counting heads, he fell upon the Negro host at Azua, and, after a short struggle, utterly discomfited them, and drove them in confusion across the frontier. The constitution of the new republic was then framed at leisure, and Santana was appointed president for eight years. Supported by his able finance-minister, Baez, he administered the government with energy and success for five years, during which a national squadron of five corvettes was organised, an army of nearly seven thousand men enlisted and equipped, and measures taken to promote white immigration. But several plots, fomented by the government of French Hayti, were set on foot; and, though he discovered and punished them all, Santana grew weary of his task, and resigned the presidency in 1848. His inefficient successor, Jimenez, contrived, in a few months, to bring every thing into confusion; and, to crown all, Soulouque in 1849 led a large army into the country, which, burning and ravaging all before it, took the road along the southern coast, defeated the army of Jimenez, and encamped on the river Ocoa, about thirty miles from the capital. At this juncture, the "Lion of Seybo" again saved his country. It reads like a romance, but yet it is plain matter of history, that Santana, at the head of only 800 men, attacked Soulouque's army, numbering 15,000 men. Seizing a strong wooded hill between them and the river, he cut them off from the water, and forced them to attack him at a disadvantage. After sustaining their assaults for sixty hours, during which they suffered heavy loss, the little garrison rushed from its stronghold, and closed in desperate hand-to-hand struggle with its multitudinous enemies. The contest was long, and no quarter was given; but at last victory declared for the Dominicans; and Soulouque led back the relics of his baffled host in ignominious flight across the border of the republic.

We hasten on to the last and unexpected scene of the drama. The Americans made strenuous efforts between the years 1850 and 1855 to gain a footing in the republic; but it was all in vain: the differences of religion, race, and language created an aversion in the breasts of the Dominicans which the prospect of great material advantages could not overcome. England formally offered her protectorate in April 1849; but the offer was rejected for similar reasons. The Dominicans desired the protection of the Spaniards. Their independence had been obtained by a revival of the old Spanish feeling, of the language as well as the religion



of Spain. They addressed themselves in vain to the captain-general of Cuba. Spain was yet too weak to encounter the risk of a quarrel with the United States. Meantime, however, having recovered from the exhaustion of her civil wars, she was rapidly rising to the rank of a leading power. The Dominicans felt their own weakness and isolation; doubtless they glowed with a thrill of patriotic sympathy at the tidings of the chivalrous campaign of the Spaniards against the Moors; and in March 1861 the signal for their reunion with the mother-country was given by the breaking out of civil war in America.

Manifestoes were prepared, and signed by all classes of the population,—Santana's own name figuring at the head of the list,—in which the sovereignty of Spanish Hayti was formally tendered to Queen Isabella II. On the 19th of May an edict was published at Madrid, reincorporating the Dominican republic into the Spanish monarchy. In the preamble of the edict it was stated, "There is nothing to change in the social state of the country; its inhabitants are free. Slavery, which is a necessity in other countries, is not necessary to the cultivation of this fertile soil, and the government of your majesty will not reëstablish it." The cession was carried into effect without delay. President Geffrard, backed by the Cabinet of Washington, protested, and even menaced; but the appearance of a Spanish frigate before Port-au-Prince brought him to his senses.

The revival of the Spanish domination in St. Domingo is important as a sign of the expanding power of Spain, and as the first in a series of steps towards the possible reconquest of Southern America by Europe. France may perhaps be reminded by it that she has ancient claims in Hayti, and an old and profitable empire to restore. But whatever the political future of the island may be, there is much reason to doubt whether material prosperity will be increased by the act which has restored to Spain her lost dependency. The pledge which the Dominicans exacted as the condition of their voluntary submission threatens to reduce their country to the level of the English possessions; and it is impossible that free labour in St. Domingo and the institution of slavery in Cuba can continue side by side under the same government, without provoking a reaction of the one upon the other, which will imperil the cause of freedom.

---

VICTOR HUGO'S *MISÉRABLES*.<sup>1</sup>

M. VICTOR HUGO was born at Besançon in 1802. His father was a soldier, a republican volunteer, promoted to be a Bonapartist colonel. His mother was a Vendéan, an ardent royalist, who, as a girl, had been carried about among the Chouan bands. In his childhood his family followed the wanderings of his father to Elba, Paris, Rome, and Naples. Thence, in his seventh year, with his mother and two brothers, he was sent back to Paris to be educated. He lived at the old convent of the Feuillantines in the faubourg St. Jacques, where he had two playfellows,—a little girl, whom he afterwards married, and a condemned Vendéan general, Lahorie, to whom his mother gave shelter, but who was traced by the police and executed in 1812. The family, thus compromised, was called to Madrid by General Hugo, who was major-domo to King Joseph. In 1813 they were again in Paris; Madame Hugo triumphed too loudly over the first restoration, and her husband separated from her for ever. In 1815, during the Hundred Days, the general was once more in the ascendant; he took his children from their mother, and sent Victor to the College Louis-le-Grand, where the compulsory study of mathematics put the last touch to his hatred of science, the Empire, and his father, and to his love for poetry, royalism, and his mother. In 1816 he composed, but did not publish, a tragedy to celebrate the return of Lewis XVIII. In 1819, at the age of seventeen, he finished his studies, and with great difficulty induced his father to allow him to follow the profession of poetry. He had lost his mother, he hated his father, and was deeply in love with a girl whose guardian locked her up from his sight.

His first poetry was inspired by a religious affection for the mother he had lost, and an enthusiasm for the royalism she had taught him. His first romance, *Han of Iceland*, was the expression of his detestation for the obstacles to his happiness,—the guardian who would not let him see the girl he loved, and his father, who had forced him to learn mathematics. A saint, by the study of the germs of wickedness within his heart, comes to feel himself to be the chief of sinners; young Victor Hugo, on the contrary, by a morbid anatomy of the motives which he attributed to those who stood between him and his happiness, came to see in them something unhuman, bestial, devilish. *Han of Iceland*, an ogre who shared a bear's den and drank human blood, was the monster which the insane exaggeration of genius

<sup>1</sup> *Les Misérables*, par Victor Hugo. 10 vols. Bruxelles, Lacroix et Cie.



formed out of a calculating uncle who objected to an imprudent love-match : Pope's lover, whose happiness could be secured by nothing short of the annihilation of time and space, was obliged to dress up the obstacle to his love in some of the attributes of the infinite chaos, and of all-devouring age.

Three years afterwards (1822) Victor Hugo had established a reputation ; Chateaubriand had acknowledged him to be an infant prodigy, money flowed in, and prudent parents allowed him to marry. The young poet, who was hardly twenty, found that even the monsters whom he had abominated had hearts in them ; the only question was, whether he had been wrong in denying it, or whether they had been changed since he first formed his judgment. The former supposition was inadmissible ; it was blasphemy against the majesty of the poet.

“Peuples, écoutez le poète ;  
Écoutez le rêveur sacré !  
Dans votre nuit, sans lui complète,  
Lui seul a le front éclairé.”

The poet's eye, in its fine frenzy, was infallible. The other solution remained ; there had been a conversion : they had come to love him instead of hating him ; and the great doctrine of which he was to be the prophet dawned upon the soul of Hugo. Henceforth he was to sing of Chaos nursed into life by the golden pinions of Eros ; of mud and filth transfigured into purest æther by the warm breath of love. The cannibal uncle, the fiendish father, had at once become gentle and amiable when they had given their consent to the union of the lovers. Even Han of Iceland, as published in 1822, had a father's heart. Hugo's next romance (1825) showed what a noble soul could subsist under the black skin of a monstrous Negro, what tender meanings under the euphonious name of Bug Jargal. But the poet had not lost his resentment against obstacles in general ; in his imagination there always remained a part of chaos which obstinately resisted the plastic power of love. In *Bug Jargal* this conception is incarnate in the black deformed dwarf Habibrah, the sorcerer, murderer, and priest of a cannibal religion. In *Notre Dame* (1831) we have a similar chaotic embryo in the dumb dwarf Quasimodo, a half-human spectre, a bell-clapper half turned into a man by a nightmare. M. Hugo describes him clinging to the swinging bell, and doubling the fury of its flight with the whole impetus and the whole weight of his body. “While the tower rocks he cries and grinds his teeth ; his red hair streams, his breast heaves like a forge, his eye blazes as the monstrous bell brays beneath him. It is no longer either bell or dwarf ; it is a dream, a whirlwind, a storm ; giddiness a-horseback on noise ; a spirit clinging to a flying car, a strange

centaur, half man, half bell." This Caliban is humanised by love for a frail Miranda called Esmeralda, who is herself raised out of the mire, spiritualised, and purified by her love for a man that cares nothing about her. This is another form of the same idea; the same love that tames the forces of chaos crystallises and purifies its slime.

"Pour que la goutte d'eau sorte de la poussière,  
Et redeviennne perle en sa splendeur première,  
Il suffit, c'est ainsi que tout remonte au jour  
D'un rayon de soleil, ou d'un rayon d'amour."

The obstacle reappears in this romance, but in a new form; it is no longer material, chaotic, devilish, but artificial and social. It is incarnate in the priest and the gentleman; Frollo and Phoebus de Châteaupers inherit the dens of Han and Habibrah. Or rather, besides the three ideas,—Love, the Chaos that submits to Love, and the Chaos that rebels,—another idea begins to make itself clear to Hugo's mind,—the idea of a cold classifying intelligence, the enemy of love, the god of routine, red-tape, and social machinery, incarnate in the rich, ruling, and privileged classes of society.

Henceforth the key to his poetry, his dramas, and his romances, is found in the chaos of ignorance, brutality, and infamy, partly converted, transfigured, and sanctified by love, partly held in thrall and worse and worse confounded by the devil of law and routine. To the former idea belong his *traviatas* rehabilitated by a disinterested affection: Marion de l'Orme, who is able thus to recover the bloom of innocence; Lucretia Borgia, whose maternal heart expiates her infamy; and Tisbé, the heroine in *Angelo*. To the same idea belongs Triboulet, the court-fool and dwarf, whom nature and man have conspired to make a devil, but who is made angelic by his love for his daughter. The germ of the saving love may lie hid under the mask of all kinds of wickedness. It is indestructible by hatred or blasphemy. It may at any moment break out through the dunghills that smother it, or the iron bars which rivet it down. For a time the love and the hate may exist together. "Chante," says the poet,—

"Chante, l'amour au cœur, et le blasphème au front."

Such violent contrasts of sudden change are dearer to M. Hugo than the platitudes of uniform routine. He thinks one such sinner-saint worth ninety-nine conventional decencies. For him it is a stale joke to make the soldier brave, the judge just, the scholar clever, or the poor man vulgar. The real business of the reformer is to "bare the base heart that lurks behind a star;" to exhibit the foolishness of the wise, and the wisdom of the fool; to show how social greatness is always united with



littleness of mind and heart, and how all that is socially abject and miserable is redeemed by an internal grandeur of soul; to exhibit purity in infamy, dignity in the convict's fetters, chivalry in the footman's livery, vice in the sacristy, baseness on the throne, and cowardice under the soldier's uniform.

It was this disposition that made him prefer Rabelais to Boileau, the romantic to the classical school. He loved accent better than flow, mass than order, colour than form. Contrast became one of the chief rules of his mind. While he had any faith, it must have been for the reason of the impetuous and materialist African—*credo quia impossibile*. He loved to join what was incapable of junction, to describe that which could not be described. He was never satisfied with a picture of reality till he had inflated it to the dimensions of the fabulous. For him an opinion began to be true as soon as it became absurd, and an act to be virtuous immediately it transgressed the limits of law. In each period of his life contradiction to rule has been his pole-star. Angel or devil has been all one to him provided it was in opposition. Whatever was definite or positive was wrong; whatever negative and indefinite was so far right. He shared this feeling with the Romantic schools of Germany and France. In Germany the school began among Protestants, as a protest against their own antecedents and against the deluge of French ideas; it has consequently grown into a Catholic movement, involving a restoration of medieval liberties that were never wholly effaced, and vying in historical importance with the classical *renaissance* of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; in France the movement began among Catholics, who also protested against their past, and it consequently developed into pantheism and infidelity. In its beginnings French Romanticism was Catholic and royalist, for the same reason that led it afterwards to kick down the cross, and to substitute the Phrygian bonnet for the crown of thorns. Its religion and its irreligion agreed in being a protest against the Encyclopædia, pigtails, and routine. Fancy was without a home in the soulless universe of rationalism, and Love flapped his wings in vain in the thin atmosphere of classifications and codes. Men yearned to clothe the dry skeleton in warm flesh, to round the angles into curves, and to fill the prim parterres with gay flowers. Many living and breathing forms presented themselves, all equally to the purpose. There were all Chateaubriand's *Beauties of Christianity*; there was the theophilanthropist of the Directory, with his one principle of religion—"do no harm;" the self-mortified priest, with crucifix in hand, rushing to battle before the wild hordes of Chouans; the old Moustache from the Pyramids or Moscow, worshiping the god of battles and the eagle; the Jacobin of the Convention, con-

demned to wander in blouse from village to village, and to play the "Marseillaise" on his grind-organ; the mediæval revivalist, with his distorted saints and emblazoned shields;—all these contained those elements of colour, warmth, and life, which theory and routine completely lacked, and the romanticist could pass from one to the other without playing false to the principles of romance. The one rule of romance was to be without rule, to prefer wild strength and tangled growth to trim alleys and clipped trees.

Romanticism was in the air when M. Hugo began to write, and the youth could not choose but inhale it. He was at a time of life when he had much fancy and few ideas; those which he had belonged rather to society than to himself; he held them rather as a sponge holds water than as the soil holds the seed. His method was his own, and he had the power of giving overwhelming mass to any idea which he chose to illustrate. He had not Shakespeare's power of imagination; he could not receive an idea into his personality, assimilate it to his own fibre, or stamp his own likeness upon it. But he could receive an idea into his fancy, illuminate it with a strong jet of some particular passion, fear or love, or hate or joy, and exhibit it in the light in which it might be supposed to appear to a dervish, a ghost, a devil, a camel, a daisy, a waterfall, or the sky, if they could be supposed to feel or think about it at all. He could not translate facts into the language of universal humanity, nor paint them in colours that are harmonious under all conditions of light; he could only translate facts into some *argot*, or slang of a clique, and paint them in colours which are not harmonious except when seen through some particular medium. This supremacy of fancy in Victor Hugo has been attributed to his studies in Spain; but it seems to us to be a characteristic of a French school, which begins with Rabelais and ends with Hugo himself. In another branch of art, Gustave Doré exhibits similar characteristics. But M. Hugo is a man of much wider reach; he combines the grotesqueness of Doré with the accumulative vastness of Martin, and the formless beauty of the colouring of Turner in his latest moods.

In 1822, in the preface to his ballads, M. Hugo professed that there was no true poetry in history without monarchical ideas and religious faith. In 1826 he declared that he was no exclusive romanticist, and owned that Calderon as often erred on the side of ignorance and formlessness, as Boileau on the side of scientific rules. His liberality with regard to form was only the precursor of liberalism with regard to ideas. He began to consider every school of thought good in its way. In 1829, in the introduction to his *Orientales*, or Lyrics of the East, he de-



clared that every conceivable situation had its place in poetry. The poet is free to believe in God or devil, or in nothing at all.

Contemporary critics said, that in these *Orientales* M. Hugo first "substituted the superstition of form for the worship of ideas." This could only be thought either by men who saw real idea and meaning in M. Hugo's earlier works, or by those who conceived that no thought becomes an idea till it is accepted with the spirit of a partisan. When he talked hazy nonsense about chivalry or monarchy, or the beauties of Christianity, he was applauded as a philosopher; when he began to write a little more clearly, but to divide his enthusiasm impartially between all forms of government or religion, he was reviled as a mere formalist. Yet, in reality, form and idea had always been one to him; the vague was his form, the vague was also his idea. For him the abyss was the seed-ground of infinite worlds; and the poet's duty was, to adopt an expression of his own, "to parody the abyss by the tohu-bohu," to symbolise the infinite by chaos, and to express chaos by grotesqueness and monstrosity, which were his substitutes for humour and power. The poet's "soul of crystal" is placed in the midst, between chaos and man, to collect the multitudinous sounds of the universe, and transmit them as an echo to the earth; he has not to make, but to collect; not to shape, but to amass, and to leave the task of organising the mass to love. Science has only a subordinate part to play; when the poet has revealed his idea of happiness to the people, the philosopher has to find means to carry it out. Science has to realise "the august vision," and to "remake Eden by algebra." Henceforth dreams must be logical—"le rêve doit calculer" (vol. ix. p. 201). But the poet is bound by no rules either of form or idea. Incoherence is his right; he collects without selecting, and amasses without measuring; he is grandiose, theatrical, antithetical. He distributes life and death. He may make stones think, feel, suffer, and sigh, and may subject souls to the laws of gravitation and inertia. As in his *Notre Dame*, he may personify marble and petrify persons, as if mind had migrated into matter and had deserted the soul.

This vagueness was carried out in politics. Ultra-royalist in 1819, he passed through all phases of contemporary opinion till he became Jacobin in 1832. In 1845 he appears as a conservative statesman; in 1848 as a socialist. But, in truth, he never had any formal politics at all, except those which his affections borrowed for the moment from his friends. Of this he was conscious: in 1834 he declared that the end of all his thoughts and all his philosophy was to "substitute social for political questions." In 1840 he said that in politics the poet should have "no engagement, no chain," no hate, and no party love,

except for the people. If he ever permitted himself to blame a human law, it must be only because he passed his days and nights in studying "the text of the divine codes." In his speech of reception into the Academy, in 1841, he praised in turn every political power that had arisen in France. On the whole, he said, "the foundation of all men's principles is good. All are doing their duty, all, from the humble labourer up to the crowned sage on the throne," and higher still, up to those "sublime academicians, who inhabit the sphere of pure ideas, seeking the perfect, meditating on the great." The truth is, that after 1830 the turn of his mind led him to leave questions of right to professed politicians, and to occupy himself, as an avowed socialist, with questions of happiness. This division soon led to opposition; he began to lay the fault of all unhappiness at the door of the politician, and to find in the law the cause of all social suffering. The object of the *Misérables* is to show how this is. Books of the kind will be useful, he says, "so long as the very organisation of society creates a hell in the midst of our civilisation, and baffles the destiny which God intended by a fate which man imposes;—so long as we have no solution for the three great problems of the age—the degradation of man by pauperism, the ruin of woman through hunger, and the starvation of the child through darkness;—so long as social suffocation remains possible, or ignorance and wretchedness are found in the world." The politician, he thinks, has no right to save the state, nor the jurist to save the frame-work of society, so long as the atoms which compose society and the state remain unhappy. These must be first cared for. The cure has begun at the wrong end, the limb has been badly set, and must be broken again before it can be mended.

Victor Hugo's religion, in its external manifestations, is built upon his socialism. He teaches that it is the social duty of man to contribute to the happiness of individuals. But it is not happiness to be forced to do what we do not like. Hence there is no right in the world to impose sacrifices upon mankind. Socialism knows nothing of heaven or hell. It does not look to a future world to redress the uneven balance of the present. It wishes to see all inequalities effaced here. Hence it only recognises that charity which voluntarily undertakes to suffer, but causes no suffering to others; which makes great sacrifices, but imposes none; which bears pain, but cannot bear to see pain. It regards the spiritual physician who would cut and brand the body to save the soul as a mere quack, as a relic of barbarism and superstition; for it sees in pain inflicted against the will of the sufferer only a force that brutalises both the man who bears it and the man who inflicts it.



In its personal aspect, M. Victor Hugo's religion hinges on the simple principle that each man's conscience is his god. The conscience is the revelation of the infinite to the individual soul. "Elle est sans fond, étant Dieu" (vol. x. p. 150). Each man is responsible to it, and to it alone; nothing can intervene between the man and it. The conscience being divine, partakes of the divine attributes; it is unfathomable, immense. It is light unapproachable, darkness undiscoverable. Hence all attempts to define it, to distinguish its laws, to arrange them in order, and to create a system of ethics as a rule of conscience, is to misunderstand its meaning. All codes, all rigid rules that determine action beforehand, and bind the impulse of the conscience, are artificial, and, as such, the reverse of divine: for they substitute a false conscience for the true, an artificial tramway for the free guidance of God. The man who lives by them is dwarfed, narrowed, iced, and at last unhumanised by them. The more honourable, strict, rigid, precise, cold, and unblamable he may be in observing his rule, the more certainly it will ruin him. There is no hope for such a man; but there is hope for the hot-blooded criminal who simply forgets his conscience, because that man has not substituted a false rule for the true; what should be his conscience is only a void clamorous for completion, not a usurper who clings desperately to a stolen throne.

A defective conscience requires light and warmth to bring it to life. It receives light, not through cut-and-dry treatises, but by examples. The model of teaching is the parable. The model teacher in the *Misérables*, Mgr. Myriel, always taught in this way, by examples, when they presented themselves; in default of them, by parables, which he invented, "allant droit au but, avec peu de phrases et beaucoup d'images, ce qui était l'éloquence même de Jésus-Christ, convaincu et persuadant" (vol. i. p. 31).

Warmth is imparted to the conscience by love; love is a contagion which produces in the cold soul the blessed fever of gratitude, charity, affection, and self-sacrifice. Love is a kind of transferable conscience, a flame at which extinguished fires can be lighted again. It may be love of an idea, provided that idea is a generalisation of any human condition, such as patriotism, socialism, the care of the sick and wretched, or the revolution which seeks to destroy the abuses of society. But the love of any idea which is a mere abstraction of artificial relations—such as law, policy, or science—can never make a conscience. All sacrifices endured for this are only egotistical and selfish. On the contrary, the love of family, wife, or children, draws a man out of himself, and forms a conscience. "La meilleure

manière d'adorer Dieu, c'est d'aimer sa femme. 'Je t'aime'—voilà mon catéchisme. Quiconque aime est orthodoxe" (vol. x. p. 132).

The growth of conscience is by sacrifice, and by this means it is capable of indefinite expansion. "Being God, it is bottomless," and can hold all that is put into it. "On jette dans ce puits le travail de toute sa vie, on y jette sa fortune, on y jette sa richesse, on y jette son succès, on y jette sa liberté ou sa patrie, on y jette son bien-être, on y jette son repos, on y jette sa joie. Encore ! encore ! encore ! Videz le vase ! penchez l'urne ! Il faut finir par y jeter son cœur." Its first demands are small and easy ; it ends by asking every thing ; and the man who makes this last sacrifice is a saint.

The love and knowledge which are kindled within us from without are not properly interventions between the man and his conscience ; between these the union is so close as to admit of no medium. External influences are useful either to kindle the germs of love and knowledge, to force one growth after another, to give opportunities for sacrifice upon sacrifice, till the character is perfect ; or else to be the example and model which the man should follow in dealing with his conscience. There is no place for grace or sacraments in M. Hugo's Christianity. Our Lord is the "Great Martyr" to imitate, not the very fuel and substance of love. It is not to Him that M. Hugo's model characters sacrifice, but to their conscience, to the love which burns within them, and for which they are indebted only to themselves. His is a religion which Zeno might have owned, and which makes Brutus and Cato as good Christians as St. Athanasius or St. Vincent of Paul.

But love has two acts ; one is sacrifice, the other is enjoyment. Wherever the real joy of love is found, some of it belongs to God : "Quelque chose de cette joie va à Dieu." But in this joy is danger ; it is a dilemma that may lead either to life or death. It may say 'Yes' where it should say 'No.' In offering the heart, it may sacrifice virtue (vol. viii. p. 9). But it must be remembered that the same dilemma is found in sacrifice ; the desolation of misery may bring life to the soul, but it may also bring death. Yet, on the whole, sacrifice is safer than enjoyment. "As the eye dilates in darkness and at length discovers light, so does the soul dilate in misfortune, and at last finds God" (vol. ix. p. 307).

In the preceding pages we have touched upon four points of M. Hugo's life. His personal history, the development of his ideas of art, his politics, and his religion. All these points are illustrated in the monster romance which he has just pub-



lished. It is a complete encyclopædia of his life and thoughts, of his art and artifices. It is the result of the labour of years, and the contents of a whole army of note-books have been emptied into it. In his intention, it is first, a "useful book;" a parable rather than a romance, for the artist has doubtless sometimes sacrificed his art in order that the philosopher might not leave parts of his scheme without illustration. For this the architecture of the plot has been complicated with irrelevant episodes, and sundry characters have been changed from persons into abstractions. Besides exhibiting his philosophy, the work also exhibits M. Hugo himself. The history of one of the characters is so exact a counterpart of much of the writer's own history, that we cannot hesitate to call it a picture of his own mind. This injures the plot. Part of it is designed to show the sinister influences of social institutions on man, woman, and child; the rest is intended to show the progress of M. Hugo's own mind. These two divisions have each its own appropriate episodes. The first comprehends all social and religious questions; the second includes all that illustrates the growth of M. Hugo's political opinions, and gives room for all displays of the peculiar powers of the writer, for all excursions into regions where he has already proved himself a master, for all that exhibits his imagination, his passion, his music, his rhythm, and his power of painting with words.

Both in taste and in spirit this romance is a great advance on all the author's former novels. Instead of virtuous demons, we have only a heroic convict; instead of preternatural dwarfs and monsters, we have symbolic men, endued with surprising strength, fortitude, ubiquity, presence of mind, and intellectual penetration. As for the spirit of the book, its great harm consists in the fact that the exceptional cases which it describes are intended to be typical of a new and revolutionised morality. In particular cases, acts which in themselves are bad lose nearly all their badness; the enormous difficulty of avoiding them, the strength of the motives which lead to them, the suddenness of the temptation which leaves no time for reflection, the ignorance and want of education of the actor, are all reasons which go far to excuse an act. But M. Hugo carefully prepares situations in which such an act is almost unavoidable, not in order that we may excuse it, but in order that we may take it for a model, and thus revolutionise our whole notions of ethics. Here is an instance: Javert, a police-inspector, comes to arrest an escaped convict, whom repentance has raised into a saint. The fugitive is hidden in a room, where a nun is on her knees at the table:

"C'était cette sœur Simplice qui n'avait menti de sa vie. Javert le savait, et la vénérail particulièrement à cause de cela. 'Ma sœur,'

dit-il, 'êtes-vous seule dans cette chambre?' La sœur leva les yeux et répondit : 'Oui.' 'Ainsi,' reprit Javert, 'excusez-moi si j'insiste, c'est mon devoir, vous n'avez pas vu ce soir une personne, un homme, il s'est évadé, nous le cherchons,—ce nommé Jean Valjean, vous ne l'avez pas vu?' La sœur répondit : 'Non.' Elle mentit. Elle mentit deux fois de suite, coup sur coup, sans hésiter, rapidement, comme on se dévoue. 'Pardon,' dit Javert, et il se retira en saluant profondément" (vol. ii. p. 434).

Now no one doubts that this is a trial from which few would come forth unstained, and a fall for which no man would dare reproach another; but it is a fall;—a frightful trial, a fall to be forgiven, but not an act to be imitated. M. Hugo's spirit is seen in the way he would exalt it into a crucial instance, to revolutionise all rules of morals, and to prove that the conscience acts not by rule, but by impulse :

"O sainte fille," he exclaims, "vous n'êtes plus de ce monde depuis beaucoup d'années; vous avez rejoint dans la lumière vos sœurs les vierges et vos frères les anges; *que ce mensonge vous soit compté dans le paradis!*" (ibid.)

In the book there is not much that is impious, and much that is touching and edifying; but if the edifying parts are examined, it will be found that one part of Christianity is always being played off against another, and that the writer is praising charity at the expense of faith, or fortitude at the expense of patience.

In that part of the plot which is intended to inculcate M. Hugo's social views, we have the same elements which we have found in his earlier romances. The ministers of love; the chaotic soul which is obedient to their influence; the chaotic soul which refuses it; and the ministers of the Anteros, or spirit inimical to love. The first of these are represented in the romance by Mgr. Myriel, Cosette, a convent of nuns, and various other persons, chiefly women; the second, by the hero of the tale, Jean Valjean, Fantine the mother of the heroine, Gavroche the Parisian *gamin*, his sister Eponine, the old *bourgeois* M. Gillenormand, and others; the unredeemable chaos is represented by a host of thieves and assassins, marauders and robbers, heartless fine gentlemen and degraded women; the type of all of them being the Thénardiens. And the ministers of the Anteros, or the devil, are all concentrated into one powerful portrait, Javert, the cold conscientious policeman and spy, the symbol of law, the high-priest of legal order, the one man for whom M. Hugo finds no place of repentance, and admits no redemption.

Of the autobiographical part of the plot Marius is the hero.



Like M. Hugo, he belongs on his mother's side to the Legitimists, on his father's to the Bonapartist Republicans. The gradual changes of his opinions are traced to the political and social influences which are brought to bear upon him ; and opportunity is taken to give deep and subtle pictures of Royalists, Bonapartists, Republicans, Socialists, and men of the barricades, with whom he is brought into contact. The two plots are united by the loves of Marius and Cosette, which form the idyllic part of the romance. The fundamental idea of *the obstacle* reappears at last in Jean Valjean himself, who offers a dumb opposition to this union of hearts. But at last his spirit of self-sacrifice triumphs ; he builds up that which his inclinations lead him to pull down, and consummates a life of suffering with a death eminently Christian in every thing but one point, but that point one of invincible opposition between M. Hugo and the Christian teacher.

The novel begins with a description of M. Myriel, Bishop of D—. Under this transparent disguise we are to recognise M. Miollis, Bishop of Digne ; and we may pause for a moment to admire M. Hugo's delicate feeling for the appropriateness of names ; no sound could be more expressive of a saintly prelate than *Myriel*, or than the name he goes by, Mgr. Bienvenu. The Bishop is completed by a sister, who is a saint like himself, who understands him, and accepts all the sacrifices he imposes on her ; and a servant, who does not understand him, but whose love and veneration stand her in the same stead. And he is contrasted with two men, a Jucundus and a Cato ; one an epicurean count and senator, an after-dinner philosopher, over whom even M. Myriel's influence passes like water over a duck's back ; and the other, G—, a regicide, a hermit, cursed by all his neighbours, but involving himself in his own virtue ; at whose death M. Myriel assists, and, instead of giving him the sacraments, kneels down and asks his benediction. Our readers may be curious to know what was this justice that had no need of redemption, and to which the Christian priest does homage, like Abraham to Melchizedec :

"J'ai passé ma vie dans la méditation," says the dying *Conventionnel*, "l'étude et la contemplation. J'avais soixante ans quand mon pays m'a appelé et m'a ordonné de me mêler de ses affaires. J'ai obéi. Il y avait des abus, je les ai combattus ; il y avait des tyrannies, je les ai détruites ; il y avait des droits et des principes, je les ai proclamés et confessés. Le territoire était envahi, je l'ai défendu ; la France était menacée, j'ai offert ma poitrine. Je n'étais pas riche ; je suis pauvre. J'ai été l'un des maîtres de l'état, les caves de la banque étaient encombrées d'espèces au point qu'on était forcé d'étaçonner les murs, prêts à se fendre sous les poids de l'or et de

l'argent, je dinais rue de l'Arbre-Sec à vingt-deux sous par tête. J'ai secouru les opprimés, j'ai soulagé les souffrants. J'ai déchiré la nappe de l'autel, c'est vrai ; mais c'était pour panser les blessures de la patrie. J'ai toujours soutenu la marche en avant du genre humain vers la lumière, et j'ai résisté quelquefois au progrès sans pitié. J'ai, dans l'occasion, protégé mes propres adversaires, vous autres. . . . J'ai fait mon devoir selon mes forces, et le bien que j'ai pu. Après quoi j'ai été chassé, traqué, poursuivi, persécuté, noirci, raillé, conspué, maudit, proscrit. Depuis bien des années déjà, avec mes cheveux blancs, je sens que beaucoup de gens se croient sur moi le droit de mépris, j'ai pour la pauvre foule ignorante visage de damné, et j'accepte, ne haïssant personne, l'isolement de la haine. Maintenant j'ai quatre-vingt-six ans ; je vais mourir. Qu'est-ce que vous venez me demander ? 'Votre bénédiction,' dit l'évêque. Et il s'agenouilla" (vol. i. p. 128).

This man, to whom the Bishop kneels, represents M. Hugo's ideal : force, love of country, sacrifice, suffering through the false principles of society, patience, and charity.

After drawing out the character of the Bishop through a hundred and seventy pages, M. Hugo introduces his hero. Jean Valjean is a peasant of Faverolles ; an orphan, who supports his sister's family by his labour. In a time of starvation he steals a loaf to feed them, and is condemned to the galleys ; of gigantic strength and abundant resources, he escapes and is retaken more than once, and goes through nineteen years of slavery for his first offence. When he is at last released, no one will give him shelter : he offers to pay at every inn and wine-shop, but no one will give him food ; Bishop Myriel receives him, feeds him, and lodges him. In the middle of the night Jean Valjean rises and robs the Bishop of some family-plate ; arrested by the police, he declares that the Bishop has given him the silver ; he is brought back, and the Bishop confirms his story, gives him in addition two silver candlesticks which he had not stolen, frees him from the police, and sends him forth with his blessing. "Jean Valjean, mon frère, vous n'appartenez au mal, mais au bien. C'est votre âme que je vous achète ; je la retire aux pensées noires et à l'esprit de perdition, et je la donne à Dieu." The benediction had not had time to produce its effects before the convict had robbed a Savoyard boy of a two-franc piece ; but this is his last crime. He cries after the boy ; he returns to the Bishop in despair, and his words effect their work within him ; he takes the penitential name of Madeleine ; sells the silver, except the two candlesticks, which he keeps as relics ; makes his way to the town of M— sur M— (Montreuil-sur-Mer), where he prospers, becomes a rich manufacturer, and finally mayor.



The story meanwhile passes to Paris, to a quartet of dissipated students, with their female companions, the description of whom is one of the dullest portions of the book. Fantine is the name of one of these women. After being deserted by M. Tholomys, and after vain attempts to support herself and child at Paris, she determines to go back to her native town, Montreuil-sur-Mer. On her way she finds the Thénardiens, who were keeping a public-house at Montfermeil. Attracted by the woman's apparent love for her children, Fantine leaves her own child with them, agreeing to pay a monthly sum for its support, and goes to Montreuil. There she finds employment in M. Madeleine's factory; but in process of time her history is hunted up by a female busybody, and she is turned out of doors by the matron. Her progress in misery is worked out in detail; the Thénardiens, who starve and misuse her child, continually demand more for its maintenance, while she continually has less to give: she sells her beautiful hair, her two front teeth, and at last herself. In a street-row she is taken up by Javert, the police-inspector, but liberated by the mayor, from whose factory she had been driven, and in whose face she spits, thinking him to be the chief cause of her misfortunes. He takes her to his private hospital, where she is tended by two Sisters of Charity, and brought back again to virtue, in a more Christian way than similar persons in former novels of M. Hugo. By a judicious construction of situations he moves our pity by each successive fall of Fantine, till he makes her very prostitution a kind of martyrdom, and encircles it with a halo of sanctity. Her fall is redeemed by her love for her child, for whose sake alone she falls.

Javert is M. Madeleine's evil genius; he is the inexorable symbol of a system of penal law which M. Hugo wishes to exhibit in the most detestable light. Javert had seen Jean Valjean at the galleys, had studied his physiognomy, and remembered his gigantic strength. When a certain Fauchelevent, an enemy of M. Madeleine, falls beneath a loaded cart, and is in peril of instant death, Javert almost dares M. Madeleine to extricate the poor man, warning him that he had never known more than one person who could do it, and that was a convict at Toulon. After M. Madeleine's rescue of Fantine, he denounces him as the real Jean Valjean to the authorities in Paris, and is called a fool for his pains. A few weeks after, a man is taken up and tried for robbery at Arras. Javert and three old convicts recognise him to be Valjean. Javert on this comes to Madeleine, confesses his denunciation, tells him how he has discovered that his suspicion is unfounded, and demands to be cashiered. Hence arises the first extraordinary trial of the new

conscience, which had been created in the convict by M. Myriel's charity, and by his own gratitude. A powerful chapter describes the "tempest under a skull," during the night when Valjean debated whether he should go to Arras and denounce himself, or let Champmathieu be convicted in his stead, for the robbery of the Savoyard. M. Hugo, with all his power, fails in the "tempest," but succeeds admirably in painting that half-resolution which is determination in the will, and indeterminateness in the imagination, and clutches for a moment at every excuse that offers, only to let it go again. The drive from Montreuil to Arras, the accidents of the journey, the hopelessness of arriving in time, the prolonged session in the court, the self-denunciation of M. Madeleine, his return to Montreuil, his arrest by the triumphant Javert, and his escape, form a noble picture. Then comes the death of Fantine, Valjean's promise to take care of her child, and the disappearance of the convict on the road to Paris. We must quote a few words of M. Hugo's reflections upon Javert, the incarnation of law and social order, who "displayed in full sunshine the superhuman bestiality of a ferocious archangel."

"La probité, la sincérité, la candeur, la conviction, l'idée du devoir, sont des choses qui, en se trompant, peuvent devenir hideuses, mais qui, même hideuses, restent grandes; leur majesté, propre à la conscience humaine, persiste dans l'horreur: ce sont des vertus qui ont un vice, l'erreur. L'impitoyable joie honnête d'un fanatique en pleine atrocité conserve on ne sait quel rayonnement lugubrement vénérable. Sans qu'il s'en doutât, Javert, dans son bonheur formidable, était à plaindre comme tout ignorant qui triomphe" (vol. ii. p. 411).

So ends the first part, which fills the two first volumes, and is called "Fantine." The second part is entitled "Cosette," and begins with an elaborate and excessively brilliant account of the battle of Waterloo, the only present purpose of which is to introduce Thénardier prowling over the battle-field, robbing the dead, and accidentally saving the life of Colonel Pontmercy, whom he drags from under a heap of slain, and who carefully treasures up the name of his saviour. Then we go back to Jean Valjean at the galleys: he had been recaptured in Paris, having first taken his 600,000 francs out of Lafitte's bank, and deposited them in a place of safety. At Toulon, by almost superhuman strength and address, he saves the life of a sailor, and afterwards drops into the water and disappears. He is supposed to be drowned, and his death is recorded in the newspapers, where it is seen by Javert. Valjean, however, escapes, and proceeds to redeem the promise he has made to Fantine. He rescues Fantine's child, Cosette, from the Thénardiens, and



takes her to live with him in a miserable house in the quarter of the Salpêtrière. He was fifty-five years old, Cosette was eight. She was the first being for whom he ever felt love: "l'évêque avait fait lever à son horizon l'aube de la vertu; Cosette y faisait lever l'aube de l'amour" (vol. iii. p. 381). On the other hand, Valjean was the first whom Cosette could ever love, and he awakened its conscience within her. Valjean, who never moved out of his retreat till dark, gained by his abundant good deeds the title of "the charitable beggar." This, and other unusual incidents, roused the suspicions of Javert, who was now police-inspector in Paris, and Jean Valjean was once more recognised by his old foe.

The second volume of this part begins with a topographical description of a quarter of old Paris, through which Jean Valjean and Cosette have to elude the pursuit of Javert and the police. The chase is more theatrical than natural; Valjean escapes over an impossible wall, keeps Cosette quiet by telling her that the Thénardiens are after her, and crouches breathless while he listens to the tramp and the curses of Javert and the soldiers on the other side of the wall. As soon as these fearful sounds are quiet, Valjean is startled with music of another kind—"un bruit céleste, divin, ineffable, aussi ravissant que l'autre était horrible. C'était un hymne qui sortait des ténèbres, un éblouissement de prière et d'harmonie dans l'obscur et effrayant silence de la nuit; des voix des femmes, mais des voix composées à la fois de l'accent pur des vierges et de l'accent naïf des enfants, et qui ressemblent à celles que les nouveau-nés entendent encore, et que les moribonds entendent déjà." This mysterious place is at last found to be the garden of the convent of the Petit Picpus, where Fauchelevent, the man whose life Valjean had saved at Montreuil, is gardener, and where the fugitives find absolute security for five or six years; a period which allows Cosette to grow from a child into a young woman, and the heroine of a story.

M. Hugo utilises the pause by discussing all the aspects of religious life "with detail, but with respect, at least so far as detail is compatible with respect." His general conclusion is, that the question of convents is one "of civilisation, which condemns them, and of liberty, which protects them." He makes great play with that of Picpus by showing the influence which it had on Valjean while he lived as under-gardener within its walls. "The convent," says M. Hugo, "contributed, like Cosette, to maintain and complete in him the work of the Bishop." While he only compared himself to M. Myriel, Valjean was humble enough; now he had begun to compare himself with other men, and he had begun to be proud—he might have fallen back into his old hatred of his kind; the convent saved him. The

contrast between the two places of captivity, the hulks and the convent, and between the two kinds of prisoners who inhabited them, gradually revealed to Valjean the highest walk of virtue, and insensibly led him to follow [it. "Il avait sous les yeux le sommet sublime de l'abnégation, la plus haute cime de la vertu possible; l'innocence qui pardonne aux hommes leurs fautes, et qui les expie à leur place; la servitude subie, la torture acceptée, le supplice réclamé par les âmes qui n'ont pas péché pour en dispenser les âmes qui ont failli; l'amour de l'humanité s'abîmant dans l'amour de Dieu, mais y demeurant distinct, et suppliant" (vol. iv. p. 354). Thus as Cosette's love had brought back Valjean towards the way in which the Bishop had placed him, so did the convent influence him by its humility.

The fifth and sixth volumes are entitled "*Marius*," and with them begins the autobiographical and political half of the romance. This part opens with an exquisite sketch of the Paris *gamin*, introducing the little Gavroche, a child of the Thénardiens, who have become thieves, begging-letter impostors, and villains, who call themselves Jondrette, and inhabit the wretched *maison Gorbeau*, from which Valjean and Cosette were chased by Javert. Then we are introduced to an excellently drawn *bourgeois* of the eighteenth century, a man of ninety years old, on whose character each successive *régime* he has lived through has deposited some fresh layer, till he has become a geological section of French manners for three-quarters of a century. M. Gillenormand had two daughters, the youngest of whom married the Bonapartist colonel saved by Thénardier at Waterloo, and became the mother of Marius. At her death the legitimist grandfather took the child away from the "brigand" his father, to educate him in hatred to all his father's opinions. The old gentleman is the chief figure in one of the legitimist *salons* of the faubourg St. Germain, in his sketch of which M. Hugo gives us a photograph of what he himself knew while he was under his mother's influence. But M. Gillenormand is continually hurting the feelings of the grandson whom he adores: he allows Colonel Pontmercy to die without seeing his son; and when young Marius finds that his father was the pink of honour, instead of the brigand whom he had supposed, the revulsion of feeling makes him an ardent Bonapartist instead of a legitimist. His assumption of the title of baron, given by Napoleon to his father on the field of Waterloo, leads to his leaving his grandfather's house. In Paris he meets with a set of young republicans, whose society he joins, but not with his whole heart. M. Hugo takes the opportunity of describing the republican secret associations of the Quartier Latin; and the



Société des Amis de l'ABC succeeds the *salons* in which Marius was imbued with his first political ideas. Marius becomes a red republican, not from conviction, but from association and friendship.

He lives by his pen. In his daily walks in the Luxembourg gardens, he sees an old gentleman and a girl always sitting in the same place. These are Valjean and Cosette: they have left the convent because Valjean is afraid he shall lose his treasure by her becoming a nun. The old man guards her like a dragon, and when he sees that she is followed by Marius, he ceases to take her to the gardens. Marius, in the mean time, sinks into poverty, and takes refuge in the *maison Gorbeau*, where the Thénardiery ply their rascally trade. Valjean is taken in by their begging letters, and Marius overhears a plot to entrap him, with the help of four of the heroes of Parisian crime. This gives an opportunity for M. Hugo to measure himself against Balzac in the description of the lowest ruffianism of France. The plot fails only after Valjean has suffered considerable violence without uttering a cry, through Marius having given information to the ubiquitous Javert, who is only sorry at not having secured the victim as well as the assassins. The episodes in this part are all remarkable; the histories of the *gamin*, of the *salons*, of the clubs, and of the Parisian Alsatia, are each of them perfect in art, and most curious in detail. Marius is the receptacle for M. Hugo's personal experiences; in fact, he is Hugo in the same sense as Byron's heroes are Byron. In both we see the same exhibition, explanation, and implied apology for the personal history of the respective writers. In Marius we see Victor Hugo himself, a creature of impulse; first a Catholic royalist, through affection for his mother, and ignorance of all outside the circle of her *salon*; then a Bonapartist republican, through the shock of a returning respect for his father, the revelation of a new sphere, and a youthful admiration of strength and glory; then a socialist republican, through sympathy with literary society, which taught him to admire a poet more than a hero, "a book like Job more than an event like Marengo" (vol. v. p. 344). In the midst of the heroic epic of Waterloo, M. Hugo pauses to tell us that not Wellington but Byron was the true hero of England; not Blücher but Göthe of Germany; not Napoleon but Cambronne of France. Now Cambronne was the soldier-poet who condensed the whole fury of Waterloo into one energetic word more expressive than nice, over which M. Hugo pours all the dithyrambic grandiloquence of his most far-fetched inspiration.

The fourth part (vols. vii. and viii.) has a double title—"The Idyl of the Rue Plumet, and the Epic of the Rue St. Denis."

The idyl begins with an historical episode on the half-revolution of 1830, the character of Louis Philippe, and the "lizards" that were working under the walls that he was building ; that is, the secret societies then honeycombing French society, and the social questions that were taking the place of politics. From this picture Marius emerges, and is guided to the retreat of Valjean and Cosette by Eponine, the eldest daughter of Thénardier, to whom Marius has been charitable, and who is in course of cleansing by a secret and self-sacrificing love for him. The courtship of Marius and Cosette, in the Rue Plumet, is the idyl which gives its title to this part. Valjean's suspicions are again aroused, and he determines once more to carry Cosette away, this time to England ; he is hastened by a warning, conveyed to him by Eponine, to decamp immediately. Her reason was, that Thénardier and his companions, who had escaped from prison, had laid a "plant" against the house. Marius, on learning this determination from Cosette, appeals to his grandfather for leave to marry her. The old libertine, tender at heart to Marius, but prickly without, offends the lover by his immoral suggestions. Marius rushes from the house to find Cosette's nest deserted, and determines to die. Here comes the epic, which begins in this part, and overflows into the next. The scene lies among the barricades of the insurrection of June 1832.

In the last part (vols. ix. and x.), entitled "Jean Valjean," after an episode on barricades in general, we have one of those constructions erected by the ABC Club in the Rue de la Chanvrerie. Hither flock many of the personages of the story : Javert to spy ; Marius to find death ; Eponine, in man's clothes, to save him ; Gavroche to see the fun ; Valjean with an undefined object, imagining that he may see Marius killed, but really with the intention of saving him : for a reversed impression of a letter from Cosette to Marius, on her blotting-book, set right again by being reflected in the looking-glass, has revealed to Valjean the state of her heart ; and a note from Marius to her, telling her he was going to die, and whither his body was to be conveyed, had fallen into his hands. He goes to the barricade as a national guard, gives his uniform to save some one who was to escape, behaves like a Christian hero, defends every one but himself, frees Javert, who will not accept the obligation of gratitude ("Vous m'ennuyez ; tuez-moi"), saves Marius or his corpse by carrying him more than a league through the sewers : at the same time giving M. Hugo the opportunity to write a long disquisition upon drainage in general, and the sewers of Paris in particular. From this situation Thénardier liberates them, only to fall into Javert's hands ; but Valjean prevails on Javert to let him carry Marius to his grandfather's, and bid a



hurried adieu to Cosette before being once more sent to the hulks. Javert, puzzled with Valjean's greatness, disappears to drown himself. Marius is nursed into life by his grandfather, who consents joyfully to his marriage with Cosette. Valjean makes the last sacrifices, endows Cosette with a splendid fortune, and reveals all the disgraceful parts of his history to Marius. Marius is mistaken on two points; he has come to know something of the story of M. Madeleine: he does not know Valjean's identity with the manufacturer, but suspects him to be the robber of his fortune; he remembers also that Valjean offered himself as the executioner of Javert. Hence, after the marriage, he gradually estranges Cosette from Valjean, and Valjean makes this last sacrifice, but dies under the agony. In the very last moments Thénardier comes to Marius to tell him of Valjean's rascality,—how he found him carrying the corpse of a murdered man out of the sewer. Marius recognises himself in this corpse, learns the identity of Valjean and Madeleine, and is informed that Javert, after being released by the insurgent who had claimed the privilege of killing him, had drowned himself. Marius hereupon pays Thénardier's passage to America, and in an agony of remorse takes Cosette to Valjean, whom he finds dying. The story of the death is touching in the extreme. M. Hugo had room enough in ten volumes to jot down the babblings of lovers; this makes his idyl so idyllic. He has room also to jot down the babblings of the dying man,—the light froth of words, which floats like scum over the twin depths of love and death. But he has the power of displaying the depths as well as the foam. Valjean dies *almost* like a Christian, with the crucifix before his eyes, to remind him of the "Great Martyr;" but without a priest, because it is enough for him to imagine that the spirit of Bishop Myriel is above him, waiting to carry him to heaven. Rejecting the sacraments, he is a model of sweetness, gentleness, and patience.

M. Hugo's book is written to show how society makes its members miserable; but he is too true an artist not to make his dying hero speak the truth; Valjean, at the last moment, tells Cosette about her mother. "*Elle a eu en malheur,*" he says, "*tout ce que tu as en bonheur. Ce sont les partages de Dieu. Il est là-haut, il nous voit tous, et il sait ce qu'il fait au milieu de ses grandes étoiles.*" The social philosopher, who prefers feelings to rules, overthrows his whole philosophy by this last outburst of feeling. After all, it is not society but God who gives happiness to one and misery to another. The inequality which society did not make, society cannot level.

From this analysis it will be seen that M. Hugo's book must not be judged as a mere romance, but rather as a set of

Platonic dialogues, as a collection of articles on art, history, and politics, and as a set of poems strung on the thread of a story. It is an encyclopædia of socialism. It is the text-book of a new philosophy. It is intended to be the symbol of the school of what we may call Social Hygeists; as Rabelais' works were to form the canon of the Pantagruelists, and Sterne's of the Shandean. It is meant not to be read through and thrown aside, but to be referred to as a dictionary, and to be consulted like a Bible. It is sententious; it gives us revised editions of Solomon's Proverbs in M. Myriel's opinions, and of Solomon's Song in Marius' thoughts upon love (vol. vii. p. 305). Age has operated almost the same change in M. Hugo as in M. Cousin. Without abandoning his old principles, he strives to reconcile them with those which he has formerly opposed, and to prove that both are right. Liberals have reason to condemn convents, but there are quite as good, and better, reasons for maintaining them. He has equal respect for the self-sacrifice of Christian charity and for the suicidal destructiveness of the worship of glory. Life and truth, in his view, are made up of contradictions, which are reconciled by coexisting, and are only brought out into needless conflict by being systematised. Age also with him is garrulous; he is mercilessly long, but he has much to say. As a philosopher, it is his duty to sound every depth, to throw light upon every abyss. For this reason he gives us the philosophy of slang, and investigates every fibre that makes up the body of Parisian rascaldom. How the light he thus throws upon *gamins* and thieves is to do them good does not appear. They are simply described; yet the book was meant to show how to find a remedy for their misery. Hence the name of the book is a misnomer. The intention clearly was to show how all misery,—the degradation of man, the ruin of woman, the ignorance of children,—is the fault of society, and how it may be remedied by social medicines. But the philosopher's elbow has been jogged by the artist, and the didactic beginnings have effloresced into idyls and dithyrambs, which, so far as any practical solution is concerned, leave the difficulty exactly as they found it. They only teach us to call old grievances by new names, to represent them by fresh images, and to impress them upon the imagination by violent contortions of language.

M. Hugo's taste, art, religion, ethics, and politics, have one feature in common; they are all rooted in the indefinite. Impulse is better than rule, colour than form, mass than order. A description, however exact it may be, must always end in mist. A sphere, however polished, must have some craggy rough spot by which it is attached to its rocky bed. At the end of the most neatly-turned sentence his pen gives a sudden



flourish, and finishes with a hieroglyphic. His imagination pantingly labours upwards, turns a sudden somersault, and disappears. It is typical in him to enumerate the materials of a barricade as a collaboration of "doors, gratings, bars, planks, dirt and paving-stones, cabbage-stalks, tatters, and *damnation*." It is the explosion at the end of the squib; the eye sees a trail of fire, then a formless glare, and all is dark again. All his descriptions collapse in this way; after he has told us all about a maiden's eyes, hair, and neck, we are dismissed with the information that she is "the sheen of a dream." After a clever disquisition on the place which the shop holds in the affections of a tradesman, we learn that it is to him "an immense diminutive of *la patrie*." A description of a lover's perplexities when he cannot find his sweetheart, ends with the big image of "*une incertitude absolue dans une brume impénétrable*." It is thus that M. Hugo strives to produce an effect by heaping up contradictions and impossibilities, and by welding together the material and the spiritual, not so as to spiritualise matter, but rather to blow it up, to intensify and *immensify* it, by turning it into gas. This is in fact the only use to which he can put spirit: he knows it is a force that can combine with matter, lending it strength and swiftness, rendering it terrible or beautiful, sublime or horrible; but he does not know spirit as pure intellect or as intellectual love. He is not a materialist, but he talks like one. His imagination is materialistic. Among the spiritual and psychical forces which he uses to intensify his material masses, the passions naturally occupy the chief place, and M. Hugo is not very nice in the uses that he makes of them. There is too much coarse paint and Greek fire in the chapter of his idyl "*Foliis et frondibus*," where he describes the garden that enshrines the soft talk of Marius and Cosette; for example:

"En floréal, cet énorme buisson, libre derrière sa grille et dans ses quatre murs, entrant en rut dans le sourd travail de la germination universelle, tressaillait au soleil levant presque comme une bête qui aspire les effluves de l'amour cosmique et qui sent la sève d'avril monter et bouillonner dans ses veines; et, secouant au vent sa prodigieuse chevelure verte, semait sur la terre humide, sur les statues frustres, sur le perron croulant du pavillon, et jusque sur le pavé de la rue déserte, les fleurs en étoiles, la rosée en perles, la fécondité, la beauté, la vie, la joie, les parfums" (vol. vii. p. 179).

Though extravagances like this are exceptional, there is always a tendency towards them. M. Hugo always holds his readers over the boiling caldron of nonsense, when he enters upon a description of any thing great, massive, terrible, or striking. He is much to be preferred when he talks of his political

experiences; then the shrewdness of age tempers the enthusiasm of youth, and the exactness of his knowledge enables him to resist the besetting temptation to rhodomontade. His descriptions become a collection of curious details, and the hieroglyphic with which his sentences end becomes an epigram. Thus he epitomises Louis Philippe's sovereignty as a crown tempered by a cotton night-cap, and a sceptre finishing in an umbrella. His antitheses have a real point when they express a truth, as when he says of the royalist *salons*, "on raillait le siècle, ce qui dispensait de le comprendre;" but become hazy when they hint a heresy, as when he says of the red republicans, "ils réclamaient la lumière avec le masque de la nuit." His definitions show some wit, much consideration, and still more power of twisting an *idée mère* into all conceivable positions, as in the following description of the *ultra* :

"Etre ultra, c'est aller au-delà. C'est attaquer le sceptre au nom du trône et la mitre au nom de l'autel; c'est malmener la chose qu'on traîne; c'est ruer dans l'attelage; c'est chicaner le bûcher sur le degré de cuisson des hérétiques; c'est reprocher à l'idole son peu d'idolatrie; c'est insulter par excès de respect; c'est trouver dans le pape pas assez de papism, dans le roi pas assez de royauté, et trop de lumière à la nuit; c'est être mécontent de l'albâtre, de la neige, du cygne et du lys au nom de la blancheur; c'est être partisan des choses au point d'en devenir l'ennemi; c'est être si fort pour, qu'on est contre" (vol. v. p. 151).

Of humour M. Hugo has very little, or rather he has a false idea of it, and mistakes the grotesque for the humorous. His humour, such as it is, chiefly consists in an uncompromising application of material images, however offensive may be the ideas joined with them, to illustrate thoughts, provided those images have the right shape. To the man who tried to cure sorrow by suggestions, a Shakespeare would say in disdain, "Patch grief with proverbs!" M. Hugo would say, "You can't cork up a hole in the heart with a bunch of rags." When he gets out of this materialism, he sometimes approaches humour thus: "Lire haut, c'est s'affirmer à soi-même sa lecture. Il y a des gens qui lisent très-haut et qui ont l'air de se donner leur parole d'honneur de ce qu'ils lisent" (vol. v. p. 338). But of a sustained flow of humour—the humour of Rabelais or Montaigne, of Swift, Fielding, or Lamb—there is no trace.

M. Hugo disdains none of the petty artifices of book-making. The short lines and the blank pages have become a necessity for French romance-writers. The transparent concealment of names under their initials, coupled with the clear indication of their meaning by other circumstances, is an artifice calculated to flatter the reader by proposing to him an enigma which he



can hardly fail to solve, and to gain for the writer the credit of both reserve and sincerity. M. Hugo is not proof against little temptations of egotism. He is not content with the great canvas on which he paints his own portrait, under the name of Marius, but takes opportunities of mentioning the saintly Bishop Hugo, who was the great uncle, and the heroic Colonel Hugo, who was the uncle of "him who writes these lines." Still higher in importance than the personal *moi* is the *moi* of the poet. The Hugo of the *Misérables* is not less prophetic and infallible than the Olympio of the Odes. Higher still is the *moi* of the Frenchman, especially if he is a representative of the French idea. This feeling crops out in such phrases as, "the Republic was the sovereignty of civic rights restored to the masses; the Empire the sovereignty of the French idea imposed upon Europe;" and, "Napoleon was the predestined constructor of the French group which was to succeed the Roman group in the dominion of the universe."

Nothing will show the length of time during which M. Hugo must have been brooding over this romance better than the continuity of its episodes with his former publications. If there is any thing new, one would naturally look for it in those passages where the exile of 1851 laments that he no longer knows Paris as it is, but only as it was, and attempts to restore its old topography and its ancient physiognomy. But even this is old. In 1825 he declared "war against the demolitionists." As senator he was always one of the leading restorers of the Gothic monuments of France. In 1832 he wrote, "This demolition of old France, which we often denounced under the Restoration, is carried on with greater barbarism than ever. Since the revolution of July, the overflow of democracy has brought with it a certain ignorance and a certain brutality also. At Paris Vandalism prospers under our eyes." His *de profundis* over the architectural victims of Lewis Napoleon is but a variation of the old theme.

If we were to quote a passage of M. Hugo as a specimen of his powers and style, we should print the 8th chapter of the second book of the first part,—"*Depth and Darkness*,"—the feelings of a man who has fallen overboard, and who cannot be picked up by reason of the storm. It is a poem in itself; it consists of passages of various styles, and it is an allegory of the wretch who has fallen out of his place in the social system, and is being crushed in the pitiless rush of its machinery. But it is too long to transcribe; and we must be content with referring our readers to it, as a specimen, in brief, of M. Hugo's multitudinous resources, of his strength and of his weakness. Equal, or perhaps superior, to this is his description of the

charge of the Imperial Guard at Waterloo, and sundry passages of his story of the fight within the barricade. In a more natural and touching strain he describes the loves of Cosette and Marius, and the deathbed of Valjean; while the accounts of the royalist *salons* are full of point, and models of historical description.

The Episodes are perhaps the least amusing, but certainly the most instructive, parts of the volumes. They form at least two-thirds of the whole; the story winds among them like a summer brook in the bed of a winter torrent. The political, and some of the social, parentheses are such as future historians must consult if they would understand the spirit of French society from 1817 to 1832. But the speculative excursions are not so happy. The philosopher who says, that because his talk sounds low he is sounding all depths, and thinks that he is probing a nation's wounds by a philological examination of its slang, simply mistakes a pun for a principle. His disquisition on the rise of socialism in the beginning of the seventh volume is, in reality, not less flimsy; but it is more important because it embodies the mistaken views of a whole people. The Frenchman who looks at all aristocracies through the medium of his own, and has learned that England is an aristocratic country, thinks that the fundamental rule of the English system must be to give "all enjoyment to the privileged classes, and all privation to the people." Because the French aristocracy retained all the privileges, and forgot all the duties, of its position, he thinks aristocracy means merely a privilege to take the fruits of other men's labour without paying for them. And this, he supposes, is the right of the wealthy Englishman. The mistake is complete. If the French definition were true, the only aristocracy in England would be the pauper class, who do no useful work, and for whose maintenance the rate-collector calls at our doors, and the guardians and overseers labour gratuitously. But the privilege of our aristocracy is, not to be sinecurists, paid for doing nothing, but to be labourers who work for the country without pay or for insufficient pay: our magistrates get nothing; our ministers and ambassadors are obliged to eke out their salaries with their private fortunes. The great privilege which the country gives her aristocracy is the privilege of self-sacrifice; it is not from the State but from nature that they have received wealth, leisure, learning, wits. The State only gives them the opportunity to spend all this in her service. At the other end of the scale are the paupers, who can or will do nothing, and whose impotence gives them exceptional rights and privileges. The truth which the French have been proclaiming in a hazy way for three centuries—"ceux qui ont faim ont droit"—has



been all the while a first principle of our government, well known, accurately limited, and honestly acted upon. "Those who are starving have a right," says the Frenchman; but he takes care not to say what they have a right to. "To ask for bread" is the way in which his government completes the sentence; "to govern," say the red republicans and the insurgents. The right of indigence is still struggling for supremacy in France. In England it has long been put down by the right of labour and property, simply because one right does not deny the other. In France distress is told that it has rights: this is a truth carefully impressed on its imagination. Is it any wonder, then, that the indigent but intelligent citizen should interpret his rights somewhat largely, and strive to realise them? In England we set our faces against these undefined rights, and surround the privileges of want with so thick a hedge of degradation, that the last idea which could come into the heads of our paupers is the idea of political supremacy.

And the reason why we can do this is, because we have acknowledged the truth, and written it in our law, that those who are starving have a right to be fed, clothed, and housed. The Christian law has said it before us: "*Necessitas extrema eo redigit, ut censeantur omnia communia. Necessitatis tempore omnia sunt communia, præsertim cibaria. Necessitas facit licitum quod alias est illicitum.*" It is no question of charity or of *bienfaisance* with us, but simply of right. It is only because the starving man has a right to be fed, and is fed if he shows he is starving, that we punish the starving man who steals. If there was not a poor-law, we should consider it an impossible abomination to send a Jean Valjean to the hulks for taking a loaf to support a starving family. The very foundation of M. Hugo's social parable makes it inapplicable to England. We may be blamed for degrading our "privileged classes" too much, for exacting of them tests of their need which tend to make them lose their self-respect; we may be reproached for spending 6,000,000*l.* a year on the maintenance of the most degraded pauperism in Europe;—but to trace the evils of our social system to our exaggerated encouragement of a privileged aristocracy is the very extreme of political incapacity and fatuity.

The Frenchman is the real slave of privileged pauperism; in order that he may deny the pauper's rights, he is obliged to wink at the most barefaced usurpations by the indigent classes. In England we have provided workhouses, where they break stones or pull oakum to prove their title, and thereupon receive the maintenance which the law provides for them. In times of

greater hardship, this maintenance is distributed at the private dwellings of the paupers ; when the distress is still greater, the fears and the good-feeling of the unprivileged classes combine to make them do more than the law compels them, and to offer voluntary contributions in aid of the poor-rates. But in France all is voluntary ; the rich give what they like, the poor take what they can ; they are establishing a custom, which will grow into a right, of demolishing whole streets in order to be paid for building them up again. Society is dividing itself into two classes : one rich, clenching its fist to clutch the gold ; the other poor, trying to force it open. Each class stands in dread of the other. Between them is a third power, appealed to by both as a mediator,—by the rich, as the saviour of society from communism ; by the poor, as the saviour of the proletariat from the tyranny of the capitalists. This power increases with the increase of the breach between labour and capital. It is the power that has banished M. Hugo from France. It is the power that sanctions, and thrives upon, the demolitions he so much abominates ; and it is also the power whose existence he justifies by making it necessary. His undefined principle, “*Ceux qui ont faim ont droit*,” excites the indigent against the capitalist, hardens the capitalist against the indigent, and justifies the dictatorship by creating a social and political necessity of maintaining a power stronger than either side alone to mediate between them.

England, we say, has solved the political question of pauperism ; but we have no wish to deny that the social question remains unsolved. Justice is satisfied, but charity is starved. The truth which our experiment has demonstrated is this : that the question of the maintenance of the pauper is one partly of justice, partly of charity ; that England is correct in principle in acknowledging the right, and wrong practically in neglecting the charity. France, on the contrary, is wrong in principle, because she makes no distinction between what the pauper has a right to have, and what the rich should in charity bestow ; but makes the whole question either one of *bienfaisance* of the upper towards the lower classes, or of undefined rights of the lower classes to take whatever they can get from the upper. The question of pauperism, which should have been the chief question of the *Misérables*, can only be solved by the most rigid distinction between duties of justice and duties of charity, between absolute rights and claims more or less reasonable. But any such distinction would be contrary to M. Hugo's fundamental principle of making no fixed distinctions at all, of condemning all rigid systems and codes as unjust, and of entrust-



ing the decision of every case as it rises to the conscientious impulse of the people pronouncing upon it. The instance is crucial, and condemns M. Hugo's whole theory as a fallacy.

But though his book is a failure as a political treatise, and not entirely successful as a romance, it is by no means a failure in other respects. Even as a wreck, it is a noble and imposing object. The multitudes of questions on which it touches, the universality of the author's sympathies, the curious details he gives about all kinds of matters, great and small, of forty years ago, make up a mass of valuable materials worth much more than the architecture of the structure itself. The irony of nature has taken a fair revenge on the poet who deliberately preferred mass to form, by condemning the formal argument which he so carefully planned, and by prizing the matter, which probably had but a secondary value in his eyes.

---

## THE EARLIEST EPOCHS OF AUTHENTIC CHRONOLOGY.

[COMMUNICATED.]

THE histories of Greece and Rome, even as handed down by the most credulous writers, do not carry us back to a very remote antiquity; and when the critical historian of the present day has carefully sifted the evidence transmitted to him, he finds but little to rely upon, even in Greek history, which is more ancient than the sixth century before the Christian era. The classical scholar, who has derived from Greek and Latin authors almost all the information he possesses concerning other nations of antiquity, and is disposed to sympathise with the intense contempt which was felt for all barbaric races, is naturally tempted to extend to the history of those races the scepticism which is the inevitable result of an impartial study of the sources of Greek or Roman history. How far is this prejudice as to the ancient history of the "barbaric" nations justified by actual critical research? Is it, in fact, as impossible to restore the history or chronology of Assyria, Persia, Egypt, India, or China, as it is to restore the history or chronology of the kings of Athens or of Rome? How far back in remote antiquity is it possible to trace the history of civilisation? What are the earliest dates which may serve as landmarks in the primitive history of mankind?

A great many works, some of them very voluminous and profoundly learned, have appeared within the last ten or twenty years, dealing more or less successfully with these questions. But the books of learned writers are not always the safest guides. Learning is indeed indispensable; but no amount of learning can make up for the want of other conditions equally indispensable. It is, for instance, difficult to accumulate more erudition in a single work than is to be found in any one of Dr. Greswell's publications; but few persons will agree with him in discovering chronological data, either in the miraculous extension of the day of Joshua's victory at Ajalon, or in the disappearance of the sun at the unnatural crime of Atreus. Yet it is essentially upon data of this value that Dr. Greswell's chronology is founded; and it is in support of such data that a considerable part of his erudition is employed. Bunsen's arbitrary manipulations of the names and numbers of the Manethonian lists—a process for which real Egyptologists, as such, are in no way responsible—have thrown a ridicule on Egyptology, which is not less unreasonable than the unmeasured praise which has, in certain quarters, been lavished on his most untenable theories.



The results of Mr. Palmer's *Egyptian Chronicles* are unhappily derived from a learned combination of very valuable with very worthless materials; and in this combination it is the worthless element which predominates. Those portions of the recent work of Sir G. C. Lewis on the *Astronomy of the Ancients* in which he treats of the early history and chronology of the Egyptians and Assyrians are characterised by an uncritical rejection of the only materials from which correct information can be drawn. Yet this work has been hailed with triumph by the opponents of what is called the "long chronology," and the learned author is supposed, at least in Scotland, to have rendered important services to the cause of orthodox Christianity. The chronological articles in the first volume of Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* are disfigured by the crotchets of a really learned writer, who was probably selected in consequence of his knowledge of Egyptian antiquities, but whose peculiar interpretation of the texts on which his chronological system is built was long ago refuted by three lines of the Vicomte de Rougé, to which all competent Egyptologists, without exception, would unhesitatingly subscribe.

It is not in an article of a few pages that it would be possible to discuss all the arguments of Dr. Greswell, Baron Bunsen, Mr. Palmer, Sir G. C. Lewis, Mr. Poole, and a large number of other writers, British and foreign, whom it is unnecessary to mention. My intention here is simply to state the method and the leading facts by which other and surer results are attained. Neither the method nor facts are absolutely new, nor are they unrecognised by all the writers just named. The chief fault, generally speaking, to be deplored in each of those writers is the unwarranted admission of at least one very questionable hypothesis which modifies the whole course of the inquiry. I shall endeavour, on the contrary, to adhere as strictly as possible to facts attested by irreproachable witnesses; and it may be well at the outset to state my conviction, that the "short chronology," which has for the last two or three centuries been generally adopted, from more or less plausible, but by no means conclusive, calculations founded on passages of Scripture, must be definitely abandoned, as being in evident contradiction with the results of irresistible evidence.

The only two nations existing in primitive times whose antiquity can be estimated by definite measures of time are Egypt and China.

Before Champollion's discoveries had opened a new world to the historical inquirer, the only sources of information re-

specting Egyptian history were Greek authorities (such as Herodotus, Eratosthenes, or Diodorus), and the fragments of Manetho which have been preserved by Josephus and the ancient Christian writers. To choose between the statements of these witnesses was almost as hopeless a task as to reconcile their contradictions. If the veracity of Herodotus be unimpeachable, the confidence which is due to assertions resting on his personal evidence cannot be extended to the statements of his informants, who may, for any thing we know to the contrary, have been profoundly ignorant of the truth. Not one of the Greek writers was acquainted with the Egyptian language, or was able to verify the authenticity of the information he received. All Greek writers are infected with the incurable fault of explaining foreign history and mythology by their own.<sup>1</sup> Of all these witnesses Manetho is the only one who, by his birth and position, may be supposed capable of consulting original historical records. But his work is unhappily lost; and the few fragments of it which remain, and which give but a very imperfect notion of the whole, have been preserved by writers who do not appear to have observed strict accuracy in their quotations, and have in many instances relied upon second-hand authorities. That Manetho's history began with dynasties of gods and demi-gods, of whose reigns no contemporary documents could exist in his time, is in itself no argument against the truth of those portions of the history which may have been derived from trustworthy sources. Some of the most valuable chronicles of France and England begin with dynasties no less fabulous than those which Manetho described, in accordance, no doubt, with the traditions of his own country. The difficulty, of course, lies in discovering whether Manetho did in fact consult really authentic documents for the later portions of his history; and, if so, where the boundary is to be traced between the historical and the non-historical parts of his work. It must be confessed that, until hieroglyphic texts were deciphered and interpreted, no means existed of settling the question. The assertion, indeed, of Sir G. C. Lewis that the royal lists of Manetho "must be regarded as the result of his own invention," would at all times have been an arbitrary assumption, as unworthy of a critical historian as the unqualified admission of those lists. But the means of testing the truth of Manetho have only

<sup>1</sup> How can a writer like Sir G. C. Lewis (*Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 356) believe that "even the native priests [of Egypt] spoke of a king Proteus, who lived at the time of the Trojan war; and they gave a detailed account of his relations with Menelaus and Helen. Their story, however, is only a rationalised form of the marvellous sea-god of the Odyssey, the servant of Neptune, endowed with prophetic powers"?



been found since it has been possible for us to study original documents, some of which Manetho himself may have had before him.

I have nothing here to say to those who in the year 1862 are so backward in the race of intellectual progress as obstinately to refuse to believe in the decipherment of Egyptian texts written in the hieroglyphic and hieratic characters, as conducted by the most esteemed followers of Champollion. I will only remark that, on the one hand, these sceptics have no arguments to produce which would not, *mutatis mutandis*, be equally destructive of the whole method of inductive reasoning to which all the advance of modern physical science is owing; and that, on the other, any person who will give himself the necessary trouble will, in a comparatively short time, be as able to verify for himself the translation of any Egyptian text as ordinary scholars are to verify the translation of a Greek or Latin text.

Had the ancient Egyptians any literature of their own? Was any portion of this literature historical? Have any of their historical works come down to us, or at least are any documents remaining which deserve to be considered as authentic sources of history? And, if so, how far and in what way do these documents throw light upon the early history of the nation? These are questions to which I shall endeavour to reply as accurately as possible.

The Egyptians had, beyond all doubt, a literature of their own,<sup>2</sup> of the exact extent of which it is impossible at the present day to form a correct idea. We can only judge of it by the fragments which have accidentally come down to us; but these fragments (which relate to a great number of different subjects) give indisputable evidence of a literature of very considerable variety and extent. That the profession of scribe was held in the highest esteem is proved both by the testimony of the monuments, and the direct assertions of the Sallier and Anastasi papyri, a favourite theme of which is the superiority of the literary to the military or agricultural life. It would

<sup>2</sup> "The Egyptians participated in the Oriental type; they had writing, but no literature or history" (Sir G. Lewis, *Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 340). "Oriental" is about as accurate a term in scientific language as "foreigner" in the mouth of an Englishman. It includes things which differ from each other in all characteristics but one, and that a purely geographical one. What type is common to Egyptians, Hebrews, Persians, Indians, and Chinese? Have the Chinese no annals; the Indians no poetry or philosophy? Does the *Nabatean Agriculture* give no notion of a most extensive and varied "Oriental" literature, which was certainly once in existence? And if Sir G. Lewis does not believe in the possibility of understanding the Egyptian texts, how can he know what is contained in the numerous existing papyri, and assert that there is in them no literature or history?

of course be idle to attach any importance to mere speculative views of the dignity of the scribe as compared with the soldier or the agriculturalist, for the highest views of the literary profession are not incompatible with the most painful realities of life; but the greatest importance is due to the fact that the writers of the papyri chiefly insist upon worldly advantages of the most tangible kind as the privileges of their order. A starving poet may consider his vocation an enviable one in comparison with that of kings or merchant-princes; but it is a very different thing to be able to boast, like Sbau-si-Charta in his instructions to his son Pepi, that no literary men were unprovided with the means of living.<sup>3</sup>

The royal hieratic canon of Turin,<sup>4</sup> and the fragment on the Hyksos period with which the first Sallier papyrus commences, leave no doubt as to the fact that purely historical writings were once to be found among the papyri. The silence of the sacred books of the Egyptians as to historical subjects is no argument against the existence of a really historical literature.<sup>5</sup> We might as well argue from the presence of the "Proverbs" or "Ecclesiastes" in the sacred books of the Hebrews, and the absence of any thing similar in the "Book of the Dead," to the non-existence of such works of philosophical reflection in the Egyptian language as those of Ptah-hotep<sup>6</sup> and Ani.<sup>7</sup> There seems, indeed, no reason whatever for supposing literature to have been a special occupation of the priesthood, or to have been dependent on religious interests. Most of our papyri are, indeed, of a religious and even ritual nature; but this is simply owing to the fact that the tombs of Egypt were

<sup>3</sup> "Mák, an schau muu amu." Sallier Pap. 2, pl. 11, l. 3.

<sup>4</sup> This is, or rather was, a list of Egyptian kings arranged in chronological order, and apparently by dynasties, with the exact length of each reign and dynasty. The hieratic manuscript containing this precious document has unhappily been broken to pieces. Some of the fragments, however, are still available to a certain extent. Two or three other manuscripts containing historical matter are known, but have as yet been imperfectly studied.

<sup>5</sup> Compare Bunsen (*Egypt*, i. 23), who asserts that the Egyptians had no historical literature "before Manetho; that is, before they came in contact with the genius of Hellas." This assertion is naturally seized upon by Sir G. Lewis as an important concession. It is, in fact, utterly untenable. What kind of historical literature the Egyptians may have had, is very doubtful; but if they had none at all, where did Manetho get his facts and numbers? We are able to verify a good many of these by means of the monuments, which prove Manetho to have been correctly informed; but it is not credible that Manetho himself derived his history from monumental evidence only. His description of the Hyksos invasion and rule is evidently derived from sources similar to the fragment in the first Sallier papyrus.

<sup>6</sup> In the Prisse papyrus.

<sup>7</sup> In a papyrus belonging to the Museum of Cairo. Some extracts from it are given by M. de Rougé, *Note sur les principaux résultats des fouilles exécutées en Egypte par les ordres de S. A. le Vice-Roi*, p. 17.



better adapted to the preservation of the scrolls deposited within them than the palaces or libraries of kings.

It is, however, only too true that whatever historical literature once existed has almost wholly perished. As scarcely a year passes without some new and important discovery, it is not indeed impossible that the most valuable historical papyri may yet be found; but, at all events, it is certain that the reconstruction of Egyptian history and chronology, which has been effected up to the present day, is independent of native historical works. But though complete historical works, properly speaking, have not as yet been found in the hieroglyphic character, it must not be inferred that historical documents are wanting. The Egyptians have left a series of historical documents such as no other nation in antiquity, except the Assyrians, ever possessed. These are the monuments,<sup>8</sup> which in countless instances bear the date of the year, month, and day of the king by whom, or in whose reign, they were erected.<sup>9</sup> The difficulties of Egyptian chronology arise, in great part, from the peculiar nature of this kind of evidence; but, on the other hand, the authenticity of the chronology, as far as it can be made out, is guaranteed in the most satisfactory way possible.

A misconception very generally prevails as to the nature of the chronological data on the Egyptian monuments, which might at once be dispelled on looking at the real facts. There is certainly not the least trace on Egyptian monuments of "the tendency of the Oriental mind to enormous numerical exaggeration." Although they often mention Meni as being apparently the earliest known Egyptian king, they never reckon from his or from any other era, but simply by the years of the reigning king, and these are never so great as to justify the shadow of a reasonable doubt.<sup>10</sup> The numerical

<sup>8</sup> Sir G. Lewis (*Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 396) quotes Niebuhr's lectures, to the effect that the Egyptians had chronology, but no history; that we nowhere meet in the monuments with historical accounts; that historical representations are found, but unaccompanied by historical inscriptions. Now what could Niebuhr know about the matter at the time his lectures were delivered? He was too excellent a scholar not to admit the truth of Champollion's discoveries as soon as he could verify them, and he certainly would have disdained to be sceptical about either the Annals of Thothmes III. or those of Tiglat Pileser.

<sup>9</sup> We have positive evidence that, from the time of the twelfth dynasty, the Egyptian year of 365 days consisted of twelve months, of thirty days each, and five supplementary days. How soon this year was in existence, we cannot say. The notation of time, however, is the same in the earliest existing monuments as in the latest.

<sup>10</sup> This observation is equally true of the numbers of the Turin Canon. The only case of a very high number is that of ninety and odd years, attributed to a sovereign whose name is missing. But some kings, Ramses II. for instance, were mere children at the time of their accession. There is no indi-

data which are thus separately furnished by the monuments, and which we have to put together, are always small. There is unhappily not a single case in which a monument professes to throw light on the chronology of an entire century. As a rule, the monuments *never* speak except of contemporary events.

The manifest inconvenience resulting from this kind of evidence is twofold: 1. The last monumental year of a king which happens to be preserved to us is not necessarily the last year of the reign. An error of several, perhaps of many, years is possible in each reign, when there is no direct evidence to the contrary. But the error here, at least, is not on the side of exaggerated numbers. 2. A difficulty, not less serious, arising from the want of an era, is the question as to the order of succession of the different reigns. How am I to know, by the comparison of a document dated from the tenth year of A with another dated from the thirteenth year of B, whether A preceded or followed B, or by what intervals of time the reigns were separated?

Such are the two great difficulties, and they involve others, which meet us at the very commencement of our inquiry; and I do not pretend to say that they are always capable of being solved. It must be fairly admitted, that as yet there are not a few reigns, of the exact duration of which we are either uncertain or wholly ignorant, and others to which it is impossible, with certainty, to assign a definite place in the chronological series. It is not the less true that the great outlines of Egyptian chronology can be traced with an accuracy which, under the circumstances, could hardly have been anticipated.

Many inscriptions, particularly when their data are combined with the data of other inscriptions, enable us confidently to trace a succession of reigns, and even sometimes to draw the most accurate conclusions as to the length of a reign. The inscription of Nahre-Si-Chaum-hotep, for instance, mentions four sovereigns as having successively honoured three generations of his family with the highest honours: Amenemhâ I. (Râ-sehotep-het), Usertesen I. (Râ-cheper-ka), Amenemhâ II. (Râ-nub-ka-u), and Usertesen II. (Râ-sha-cheper). Numerous other inscriptions of this period enable us by their precise dates to determine still farther the lengths of the several reigns. We know, for instance, that the first year of Usertesen I. comes immediately after the ninth of Ame-

cation in the texts either that the year was shorter in earlier than in later times, or that human life was longer; although a hundred and ten years seem to be counted (Prisse papyrus, fin.; cf. Anastasi, iii. pl. 4, l. 8, and iv. pl. 4, l. 4) as the full sum of a long life.



nemhâ I. We learn from the inscription of Aâhmes, son of Abna, who says that his father was lieutenant of the king Râ-sekenen, that he himself served the kings Aâhmes I. (Râ-neb-peh-ti), Amenophis I. (Râ-sor-ka), and Thothmes I. (Râ-ââ-cheper-ka). His namesake and contemporary, Aâhmes Pensuben, speaks of his own services under Aâhmes I., Amenophis I., Thothmes I., and Thothmes II. (Râ-ââ-cheper-en). The inscriptions of Thothmes II. speak of Hatasu, his sister and wife, as associated with him in the government; and after the death of Thothmes II. the name of Hatasu appears on the monument associated with that of Thothmes III. (Ramen-cheper). Whatever difficulties previously existed, with reference to the relationship of Thothmes III. with his predecessors, have been completely solved by a text lately discovered by M. Mariette, in which Thothmes III. speaks of Thothmes I. as his father. Similar evidence is found of the births and relative order of his immediate successors. In the treaty with the Hittites, Ramses II. calls himself the son of Seti I. (Râ-mâ-men), son of Ramses I. (Râ-men-peh-ti).

The most remarkable series of such inscriptions are undoubtedly those discovered by M. Mariette in the Serapeum, relating to the Apis bulls. One of these sacred animals was born in the twenty-eighth year of Sheshonk III. (Râ-user-mâ-sotep-en-Amen, Amen-meri-si-Bast), lived twenty years, and died in the second year of the king Pe-mai. Another Apis was born in the twenty-sixth year of Taharka, and died in the twentieth year of Psammitichus I. A hundred and sixty-eight steles in honour of this Apis have been found, fifty-three of which bear dates. Another Apis, born on the nineteenth Mechir, in the fifty-third year of Psammitichus I., lived sixteen years, seven months, and seventeen days, and died on the sixth Paophi of the sixteenth year of Neko II. This bull was succeeded by another, born on the seventh Paophi of the sixteenth year of Neko II., lived seventeen years, six months, and five days, and died on the twelfth Pharmouti of the twelfth year of Apries.

As documents of this kind bring us down past the time of Cambyzes, and even into the Ptolemaic period, that is, into a region of known chronology, we are able, by means of the Apis inscriptions alone, to go back from Cambyzes to the first year of Tahraka, at the beginning of the seventh century before Christ; the limit of possible error being two or three years at the utmost.

Besides the monuments which give accurate dates or successions of kings, there are others from which conclusions less determinate, but by no means unimportant, may be derived.

The monument of a king is sometimes found to be composed of materials which had already been employed in the construction of a former sovereign's. Sometimes the inscription of the earlier king has been erased, and a fresh inscription engraved. Such stone palimpsests are of great value. We are sometimes able by them to determine the relative chronological positions of two or more sovereigns, the first and last of whom may stand in known relations to whole series of other kings. When there are so many royal names to classify chronologically, every fixed limit that can be determined is of value. Several of the kings whose tombs are mentioned in the Abbot papyrus, recently published, were hitherto unknown to us; but their date is at least anterior to the papyrus which speaks of them. We may be doubtful as to the exact place of some of the kings in the Chamber of Karnak; but it is at least certain that none of them lived later than Thothmes III.; and as we know his immediate predecessors, we must look for a period anterior to the eighteenth dynasty.

There are, again, documents, such as the Tablet of Abydos, and others,<sup>11</sup> which contain real series of royal names. It would, of course, be rash, and experience shows that it would be wrong, to conclude that these names imply an uninterrupted succession of reigns; but such series are of immense use as at least guiding enquiry.

It is also chiefly as guiding enquiry that the Manethonian lists have been of value. There is the most certain evidence from the monuments that Manetho's chronology was really derived from native and (to a great extent at least) trustworthy sources. His dynasties, as far as we can verify them, correspond to real series of kings, whose succession in dynasties is proved by monumental evidence. His fourth dynasty really lived and flourished at Memphis at some time previous to the twelfth, which was really Diospolitan. The latter was anterior to the Hyksos invasion; and the Hyksos were anterior to the eighteenth dynasty, of which Amosis was really the first king. The twenty-second dynasty was really Bubastite in its origin; the twenty-fifth really Ethiopian; the twenty-sixth really Saitic. The monumental evidence is always obscure at the beginning and at the end of each dynasty. The names and numbers in the Manethonic lists, as they have come down to us, are often extremely corrupt, but they are

<sup>11</sup> M. Mariette, in a letter to M. de Rougé, published in the *Revue Archéologique* of July 1860, describes a tablet discovered by him, which contains no less than forty royal names; a larger number than will be found in English history between William the Conqueror and Queen Victoria. All but twelve of these names were already known, and they are placed in an order which simply confirms the conclusions long since arrived at by Egyptologists.



not purely imaginary. Even as far back as the twelfth dynasty the length of the reigns is strikingly in accordance with monumental evidence. When, therefore, we speak of the twelfth, eighteenth, twenty-second, or other dynasties, we speak of dynasties whose historical existence and relative chronological positions are as completely verified as those of the Merovingian and Carolingian kings.

Sir George Lewis in his recent work first dismisses Manetho on the ground that his system is at variance with those of Herodotus, Eratosthenes, and Diodorus; and that "having no sufficient ground for selecting any one of these systems, we are compelled, by the laws of historical evidence, to reject them."<sup>12</sup> The important fact that Manetho's evidence, and his alone, is confirmed by an enormous mass of monumental evidence, is here entirely ignored; but in another place we are told that because Manetho's testimony is worthless, "a theory of hieroglyphical interpretation which implies the historical truth of the Manethonian dynasties rests on a foundation of sand."<sup>13</sup> This is not historical criticism, but sophistical special pleading.

We have, I repeat, certain proof that Manetho did not invent either the names of the kings or the numbers representing the duration of reigns. There is every reason for believing that his work, if preserved, would have been of the utmost utility in restoring the history of Egypt, and solving difficulties which will, in all probability, never be cleared up. Even the wretchedly corrupt fragments of it which remain are of undoubted value to the historical inquirer. But how far is it safe to trust to their guidance?

That absolute confidence cannot be placed in them ought to be manifest to every one. We have not the original work of Manetho to consult. There are important discrepancies between the various citations of his work which have been transmitted to us. We have only to compare the different Mss. of the first chapter of St. Matthew, or the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old Testament with Josephus and with each other, to be satisfied that names and numbers cannot be transmitted through many centuries, particularly by men ignorant of the original language, without becoming almost hopelessly corrupt. The Egyptian scholar can identify a large portion of the Manethonian names with genuine Egyptian ones. Ammenemes, Amosis, Amenophis, Tuthmosis, Sethos, and Sesonchosis correspond closely enough to Amenemhâ, Aâhmes, Amenhotep, Thothmes, Seti, and Sheshonk. Osorthron, the second king (according to the lists) of the twenty-second

<sup>12</sup> *Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 348.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* p. 393.

dynasty, and successor of Sesonchosis, is certainly Osarkon, the successor, according to the monument, of Sheshonk I. Petubastes, the predecessor of Osorchon in the twenty-third dynasty, is certainly Petsi-bast, predecessor, according to the monuments, of Osarkon III. It is easy, again, to identify Mykerinos, of the third pyramid, with the hieroglyphic name Menkaura, found on the sarcophagus of that pyramid; and scholars who are aware that the sounds *ch* and *sh* were often interchanged in the Egyptian dialects of all periods, will not be at a loss to identify the name Chufu, or Shufu, of the builder of the great pyramid, with  $\chi\epsilon\omicron\psi$  in the Ionic dialect of Herodotus, or the  $\Sigma\upsilon\phi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  of Manetho. Other identifications less palpable to the uninitiated are not less certain to those who have carefully studied the Greek mode of transcribing Egyptian names. But when all this is admitted, it remains no less certain that a good many of the Manethonian names as they now stand are so corrupt that there are no means of even guessing their original form.

The numbers indicating the lengths of reigns are often surprisingly in harmony with the testimony of the monuments; but this is not always the case, and it would be a miracle if it were; for numbers are more easily and more hopelessly corrupted by successive transcriptions than even names. We can sometimes detect errors in these numbers; we can even sometimes, on good authority, conjecturally correct eighteen into twenty-eight, or *vice versá*; but when the monuments fail us, what is to be done? Another serious difficulty is the fact, that the royal hieratic Canon of Turin contains several early reigns, of which there is no trace in the Manethonian list.

I believe, therefore, that Manetho's evidence is valuable: first, in so far as it leads to the discovery of truth which might otherwise not easily be discoverable; and, secondly, in so far as it is confirmed by monumental evidence; but that it is utterly insufficient when no means of verification are available. The period of Manetho's first three dynasties, for instance (a time of 769 years according to the lists), has apparently left no trace either of monumental or any other kind of evidence; and we have no means of testing the accuracy either of Manetho or of the Canon of Turin. The monuments of some other dynasties are entirely without dates. The hypothesis of contemporary dynasties has, I think, been as arbitrarily assumed by one set of writers, as it has been arbitrarily rejected by others; and on this subject the Manethonian lists are silent. Yet some solution of the question is absolutely necessary, if these lists are to be made the



instrument of calculating the duration of the Egyptian history.

The Turin Canon, where still available, is, of course, even more valuable than Manetho, from its high antiquity, and the uncorrupt state of its names and numbers wherever the papyrus is unmutilated. But, like Manetho, it requires verification. When we learn from it that Men-ka-hor, Tat, and Unas, the three last kings of the fifth dynasty, reigned eight, twenty-eight, and thirty years respectively, this information is neither to be simply rejected nor to be unconditionally accepted. There is a presumption in its favour, owing to the accuracy of the Canon where it can be verified; but this presumption cannot make up for the want of verification where this is impossible.

The different kinds of evidence of which I have already spoken may, then, be classed as follows:

1. Monuments bearing a date of a reigning sovereign.
2. Monuments merely proving relations of anteriority and posteriority between two or more sovereigns.
3. Monuments determining exact chronological relations between successive sovereigns.
4. The lists of Manetho and of the Turin Canon.

To these a fifth kind must be added,—that of monuments furnishing *absolute* dates. These monuments are, unhappily, very few in number. The oldest is a fragment of a monument bearing the name of Thothmes III., the fifth king of the eighteenth dynasty. It identifies the 28th day of the month Epiphi with the rising of Sirius. This is an astronomical date, which, as M. Biot has shown,<sup>14</sup> belongs to the year 1444 B.C. If to 1444 we add the years of the first four kings of the dynasty (81 being the probable sum), it will follow that the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty goes back as far at least as 1525 B.C. No objection can possibly be made either to the interpretation of the monuments, or to the accuracy of M. Biot's calculation. If the monument be really of the time of Thothmes III., and if there be no error in the text itself, the date must be considered as certain. Lepsius, to save the Manethonian chronology, conjectures that the Egyptian engraver erroneously wrote III. instead of II. in the notation of the month, which would throw the date considerably back. But, as M. de Rougé replies,<sup>15</sup> "Ce n'est pas ainsi qu'on peut lever une difficulté de cette gravité; le monument, aujourd'hui à Paris, est comme gravure, de la plus grande beauté;

<sup>14</sup> "Recherches de quelques dates absolues qui peuvent se conclure des dates vagues inscrites sur des monumens égyptiens." *Acad. des Inscr.* t. xxiv.

<sup>15</sup> *Etude sur une stèle égyptienne*, p. 220.

il appartient du reste à l'époque où les inscriptions présentent la correction la plus parfaite."

Another difficulty arises from a doubt whether the monument in question be really of the reign of Thothmes III. Its mutilated state renders proof impossible. The name of the king, of course, only shows that the monument is not more ancient than his reign; and that it is in fact later seems more than probable<sup>16</sup> from other astronomical dates calculated by M. Biot; one from a monument of Ramses III., the other from a monument of one of the sons of that monarch. The first of these monuments, which determines a rising of Sirius on the first Thoth of the twelfth year of Ramses III., identifies that year with the year 1300 B.C.; the second monument gives the date 1240 B.C. Now if to 1312 B.C. we add 412, the approximate number of years of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, we are carried as far back as 1724 B.C. for the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty. This date cannot, of course, be given with the same confidence as those resulting from the Apis inscriptions; but when we consider the many long and glorious reigns of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, of which such splendid monuments still remain, and which we know to have intervened between the first year of the eighteenth dynasty and the year 1312 B.C., it will be evident that the error cannot be enormous.

The eighteenth dynasty was immediately preceded by the period of the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings. Their presence in Egypt at this time is attested by the texts, which speak of them as a pestilence; and we are expressly told that Ahmes took possession of their stronghold Auaris in the sixth year of his reign, and drove them out of Egypt into Palestine. We have no information as to the duration of their rule, except what we learn from Manetho, who says they reigned *for 511 years*. The monuments give no indication as to the time of their entrance into the country. The period of their rule is, indeed, chiefly characterised by its poverty in monuments. The latest researches, it is true, have shown that these foreign rulers—in their last years at least—were not so absolutely hostile to the arts and civilisation of Egypt as had hitherto been supposed; but their own monuments give us little chronological information.

It is, however, certain that they were not yet in Egypt at the time of the twelfth dynasty. This was a period of wonderful prosperity and splendour. We have numerous inscriptions belonging to it, which prove that the native kings of

<sup>16</sup> See M. de Rougé, Notice de quelques textes hiéroglyphiques récemment publiés par M. Greene, p. 20.



Egypt were powerful in the north of the country, and had extended their dominion to the very heart of Nubia. They were also masters of the peninsula of Mount Sinai. The hypothesis which places the arrival of the Hyksos at the end of the twelfth, or beginning of the thirteenth dynasty, is no longer tenable. The monuments of Thebes, Southern Egypt, and Nubia, might be consistent with the hypothesis of a Hyksos kingdom in the north; but the presence of equally important monuments of the Sebek-hoteps at Bubastis and Tanis would alone be sufficient to overthrow this hypothesis, and the recent discoveries of M. Mariette<sup>17</sup> have brought to light monuments of the thirteenth dynasty, on which the Hyksos kings had subsequently caused their own names to be engraved. It is impossible to resist the conclusion, that after the twelfth dynasty a tolerably long succession of kings must have reigned in Lower Egypt before the Hyksos invasion. When M. Mariette says, "La chronologie doit désormais placer les 511 ans des Pasteurs entre le commencement de la dix-huitième dynastie, et une série de rois qui mènent très vraisemblablement les listes royales jusqu'à la fin de la quatorzième," the only objection that can be raised concerns the number 511; not that the number is to be simply rejected, but that it has still to be verified. Until this verification becomes possible, a real gap must be allowed to exist in the chronology of Egypt between the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty and the end of the twelfth. We may call this interval  $x$ ; but in computing the entire duration of the Egyptian empire, we must remember that  $x$ , although an unknown quantity, is certainly not a *small* one. It includes the whole of the Hyksos period, and a considerable number of reigns of kings anterior to this period.

With the twelfth dynasty we once more meet a clear and definite chronology. The order of the succession is perfectly certain, and so is the duration of the dynasty. It ruled for 213 years over both Upper and Lower Egypt. If this number be added to  $1725 + x$ , it follows, from what has already been said, that the commencement of the twelfth dynasty must be placed at a time very considerably earlier than the year 1938 B.C.

The interval between the foundation of the Egyptian monarchy and the beginning of the twelfth dynasty may be divided into the following periods:

A. The period corresponding to the three first dynasties of Manetho.

<sup>17</sup> See his letter to M. de Rougé, "Sur les fouilles de Tanis," in the *Revue Archéologique* of February 1861.

B. The period of the fourth and fifth dynasties.

C. The period between the fifth and twelfth dynasties.

Of the first of these periods no monumental remains have yet been recognised. Its existence, however, is not only attested by Manetho, the Turin Canon, and the lately-discovered tablet of Memphis, but presupposed in the existence of the monuments of the second period.

The earliest monuments known are the great Pyramids and the numerous other contemporary sepulchres in the neighbourhood of Memphis, built by the kings and grandees of the fourth and fifth dynasties. Independently of the vast power which is proved by the mere construction of the pyramids, the dominion of the kings must have extended as far south at least as the quarries of Syene, and their monuments are found in the peninsula of Mount Sinai. There is scarcely a characteristic, either material or moral, of the Egyptian civilisation, which may not be discovered in this earliest monumental period. There is not the slightest trace of growth: the architecture, the sculpture, and all the other arts of this period, even at its commencement, bear witness not to the infancy of a people, but to the plenitude of its maturity. This period implies the existence of a former period during which all the foundations of this prosperity were laid.

The third period differs from the second, not only in the character of its monuments, which are not so exclusively consecrated to the memory of the dead, but by the abundance of dates which are found in the inscriptions. These dates, however, are as yet insufficient for any accurate chronological computation. Nor do the monuments enable us to verify the hypothesis of contemporary dynasties, which a comparison between Manetho's lists and the Canon of Turin renders not improbable for this period, though it is certainly untenable for the previous period.

Before the year 1938 B.C. we are therefore compelled to admit four periods, each of undetermined, but of considerable, length. Even if the hypothesis of contemporaneous dynasties be admitted wherever it is possible, the number of successive reigns will still remain very great. I do not mean reigns the existence of which is known only from the lists of Manetho or the Turin Canon, but such reigns as have left very tangible memorials behind them. It was not in a day that the great Pyramid was built; nor could the reigns of the builders of the second, third, and numerous other large pyramids have been very short.<sup>18</sup> And when we find inscriptions of the six-

<sup>18</sup> "The Taj Mahul, near Agra, in Northern India, erected by Shah Jehan as a mausoleum for himself and his queen, in the seventeenth century, is an



teenth or eighteenth years of another king (Pepi-Meri-Râ, for instance), we cannot be sure that these numbers give any fair notion of the real length of the reign. It is quite impossible, in an article like the present, to give the reader the exact impression caused by the study in detail of the remains of these early periods. I will only say that there is actual evidence of *at least* as many successive reigns in Egypt prior to 2000 B.C. as can be counted in five centuries of English or French history, and that the real number of such reigns may have been very much more considerable. Should Manetho's estimate of 511 years for the Hyksos period (not to mention any other) ever be verified, the commencement of the Egyptian monarchy will have to be placed at an epoch anterior by some centuries to 2500 B.C. More definite results cannot at present be given with absolute certainty.

The monuments of Egypt throw light not only on the history and chronology of the nation which erected them, but on those of the Hebrews and others.

Two Egyptian kings, Tirhakah and Pharaoh Necho, play an important part in the sacred history. Tirhakah, the Ethiopian contemporary of Ezechias king of Judah and of Sennacherib king of Assyria, began to reign, as we learn from the Apis inscriptions, in 695 B.C., and was still living in 669. Pharaoh Necho, the contemporary of Josias king of Judah, and of Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon, reigned from 611 B.C. to 596. The important synchronism between Rehoboam the son of Solomon, and Shishak or Sheshonk first king of the twenty-second dynasty, cannot be fixed with the same chronological accuracy; but the approximative date of the Exodus is determined by the cumulative weight of arguments which are convincing to all who have not made up their minds beforehand in favour of another date.

1. In the first place, we are told that the oppressed Israelites were employed in building treasure-cities called Pithom and Raameses or Ramses.<sup>19</sup> It was from Ramses that the Exodus itself took place. The name of this town is as significant as the names of Alexandria, Ptolemais, Seleucia, or Washington. Several places of the name are known to us from the Egyptian texts, and every one of them is so called from the great Ramses II. of the nineteenth dynasty. Names

immense and splendid edifice. Its cost is reported to have exceeded three millions sterling, and the work to have occupied twenty thousand men for twenty-two years" (Lewis, *Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 438). What time then must not all the large pyramids of Egypt have taken in building, one after the other!

<sup>19</sup> The difference of vocalisation of this name in different places of Scripture is purely accidental. See Gesenius, *Thesaur.* in voce.

are themselves important chronological data ; and it may be safely asserted, without fear of future contradiction from monuments, that neither king nor town of Egypt was called Ramses before the nineteenth dynasty. At all events, the *onus probandi* lies on those who, not content with the known kings or places called Ramses, postulate others at an earlier period.

2. Several of the kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties were great conquerors, and they extended their dominions as far as Mesopotamia. Syria, including Palestine, is often mentioned as the scene of their victories or razzias. Had the Israelites already been in possession of the Promised Land, it is impossible that some collisions should not have often taken place between them and the Egyptian invaders and oppressors of the country. Yet none such are hinted at either in the sacred narrative or in the Egyptian texts. Since the publication of the second volume of Brugsch's *Geography*, and still more since that of M. de Rouge's late essays on the monuments of Thothmes III., I do not suppose any competent person will still venture to affirm that names of Palestine proper are not found on the monuments of the eighteenth dynasty in the list of Egyptian conquests.

I am, indeed, aware that Sir George Lewis asserts that "the notion of a great Egyptian conqueror who overran all Asia as far as the Ganges, and subdued the western part of Europe, is not only quite inconsistent with the Jewish annals, which reach back, in an uninterrupted stream, at least as far as Solomon and David, but also with the earliest traditions of authentic Greek history." The conquest of the Ganges is certainly no part of the genuine Egyptian story of the great Ramses. But I cannot understand why Jewish annals which reach as far back as Solomon and David, or authentic Greek traditions which do not by any means reach so far back, should be expected to speak of an Egyptian conqueror who flourished before either the Jewish or the Hellenic nations were in existence. "The monuments," continues Sir George Lewis, "cited by Herodotus in proof of the conquests of Sesostris are not more conclusive evidence than the relics of Jason, Ulysses, and Æneas, preserved in various towns of Italy, which were held to demonstrate the former presence of those heroes on the Italian coast. Herodotus had seen one of these monuments in Palestine ; he mentions two others as extant in his time,—one between Ephesus and Phocæa, the other between Sardis and Smyrna ; but he declares that the rest had disappeared."

The author of this passage is apparently not aware that some of the Egyptian monuments alluded to by Herodotus are



still to be seen. In the *Denkmäler* of Lepsius (Th. iii. pl. 197) copies will be found of three triumphal tablets of Ramses II. carved on the cliffs near *Beyrut*. The tablets have unfortunately suffered great injury. The name and title of the king, and part of the pictures, are alone preserved. One of them, *c*, has the date of the second year of his reign; another, *b*, is dated from the fourth year and the month *Choiak*. In *a* the king smites a kneeling prisoner before the Egyptian god *Ptah*. In *b* he holds a prisoner by the hair in presence of *Horus*. In *c* the god is *Ammon*. If the relics of *Jason*, *Ulysses*, and *Æneas* were equally conclusive of the former presence of those heroes on the Italian coast, I think they had a good deal to say for themselves. The Asiatic conquests of the Egyptian kings are attested by the best kind of historical evidence that can be imagined. If Ramses II. in his inscriptions speaks of his warlike expeditions in Syria, the cliff-tablets of the *Nahr-el-Kalb*, which exist to this day, prove his veracity. But long before the time of Ramses II., both *Ahmes* the son of *Abna*, and *Ahmes Pensuben*, speak in their sepulchral inscriptions of having accompanied *Thothmes I.* in his victorious expedition to Mesopotamia. We know quite accidentally, but not the less confidently, from the annals of *Thothmes III.*, that a triumphal tablet of *Thothmes I.* was in existence on the banks of the river of Assyria. We have, then, the important fact of the presence, nearly 1700 years before the Christian era, of an Egyptian conqueror in central Asia attested by no less than three contemporary and perfectly independent witnesses. The military expeditions of *Thothmes III.* and *Seti I.* are equally beyond all doubt; and there is even evidence that a great part of Asia remained tributary to Egypt during the rule of the monotheistic Sun-worshippers.

3. A third indication of the date of the Exodus is to be found in the fact, that the Israelites, instead of taking the direct road into Palestine, took the way of the Sinaitic desert, in order to avoid the Philistines, who had already settled on the coasts of Palestine. Now the Philistines had probably not yet settled in Palestine till the end of the nineteenth or beginning of the twentieth dynasty. They are never mentioned till then in the Egyptian texts, although their geographical position and their warlike spirit would have brought them at once into collision with the Egyptian kings when the latter invaded the country. They first appear on the monuments of Ramses III., and they are pictorially represented with unmistakeable characteristics. Their physical type is quite different from that attributed by the Egyptian artists to the Canaanites: their beards are shaved, their tunics short

and not reaching below the knee.<sup>20</sup> Their headdress is peculiar. The inscriptions speak of them not as natives of Palestine, but as having come in ships, like the Tsakkari and other races, "from the isles of the great sea,"—i. e. the Mediterranean. This is at the beginning of the twentieth dynasty; but the monuments of Ramses II., half a century before this, give us the picture of the siege of Ascalon by that great warrior; and the defenders of the town in this picture are not Philistines, but Canaanites, with a physical type not unlike the Jewish,—with long beards, and with dresses coming down to the heels.

The year 1312 B.C., or the commencement of the twentieth dynasty, seems, therefore, to be the limit *near which* the date of the Exodus must be fixed. The Exodus cannot have taken place either much before or much after this.

This date, indeed, though closely agreeing with the Jewish tradition on the subject, is not easy to reconcile with conclusions drawn from certain numerical data in the Holy Scriptures.<sup>21</sup> But these numerical data are not less at variance with each other than with the proposed date; and Biblical scholars, whether Catholic or Protestant, however anxious they may have been to defend the literal authenticity of every word of the sacred text, have one and all been obliged, in their chronological computations, to neglect one or the other of the data in question.<sup>22</sup> If any one, therefore, feels inclined to

<sup>20</sup> See the first plates of Brugsch's *Geographie*, vol. ii. and the corresponding text.

<sup>21</sup> This is, perhaps, stating the case too strongly. According to 1 (3) Kings vi. 1, Solomon's temple began to be built 480 years after the Exodus. If Solomon's reign be placed about 1000 B.C., it is evident that the date circ. 1312 B.C. is much too late for the Exodus. But the date 1000 B.C. is not a purely Scriptural one, any more than 1312. Both are based upon arguments, more or less cogent, derived from profane chronology. If profane chronology may be sacrificed, there is no reason why 832 B.C. should not be assigned to the first year of the building of the temple.

<sup>22</sup> The freedom with which Protestant writers have discussed the length of the interval between the Exodus and the building of the temple may seem to be only natural; but it is important to observe that Catholics of the most unquestionable orthodoxy have permitted themselves the same freedom. Melchior Canus, for instance (*De Locis Theol.* xi. 5), argues at length against the number 480, which he believes to be corrupt. He says, "Non existimo fidei aut religionis questionem esse, num 480 iste annorum numerus, qui in codicibus pervulgatis reperitur, librorum vitio scriptus sit, an potius idem ab auctore sacro in suo exemplari positus. Ostendimus enim errorem in numeris promptissimum esse atque facillimum. Ostendimus numeros quosdam in libris sacris ex scribentium errore vitiatos. Ostendimus denique multas esse causas, cur hic de quo agimus, 480 annorum numerus corrupte esse inductus videatur." Emmanuel Sa and Riccioli, both of them learned Jesuits, also consider the number as corrupt. Father Petavius (*De Doctr. Temp.* tom. ii. p. 38 sqq.) shrinks from this decision, but nevertheless argues against the number, as requiring to be explained away (commodâ aliquâ interpretatione explicandus), and thinks the right number to be 520. He says, like Melchior



quarrel with the proposed date, as being in opposition to the sacred text, he is bound to show that the date he himself advocates is not liable to the same objection.

If, however, from the numerical we pass to other data in Scripture, we find these in close accordance with our date. It is generally allowed that the numerous genealogies found in Scripture of persons who lived between the Exodus and the dedication of Solomon's temple agree with a period of three, rather than of four, five, or six centuries. Let us take, for instance, a genealogy known to every body,—Aminadab, Naasson, Salmon, Booz, Obed, Jesse, David, Solomon. If no name has been omitted in this list, it is difficult to count more than three centuries from Aminadab to Solomon. But names were, in fact, often omitted in genealogies; and they are notoriously omitted in this very genealogy, contained in the first chapter of St. Matthew, who counts but twenty-six generations from David to St. Joseph, whereas St. Luke counts forty-one. This is the objection made to the argument drawn from the genealogies; and my reply is, that a single genealogy is by itself but very feeble evidence, but the evidence becomes strong when several independent genealogies lead to the same result, or even when a single genealogy is corroborated by other evidence. In the present case we have a large number of genealogies corroborated by the strongest independent evidence.<sup>23</sup>

Canus, "Non est fidei quæstio quæ de intervallo illo disputatur." Father Tournemine counts 520 years like Petavius; Serrarius, another learned Jesuit, 680; and Pezron 962.

<sup>23</sup> Mr. Poole's date of the Exodus, 1652 B.C. (see the chronological articles in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*), is based on a heap of assumptions of the most questionable character. For instance:

"The civil commencement of the Hebrew year was with the new moon nearest to the autumnal equinox; and at the approximative date of the Exodus obtained by the long reckoning [as if there were not a dozen different, and equally plausible, long reckonings!], we find that the Egyptian vague year commenced at or about that point of time. This approximative date, therefore, falls about the time at which the vague year and the Hebrew year, as dated from the autumnal equinox, nearly or exactly coincided in their commencements. It may be reasonably supposed that the Israelites in the time of the oppression had made use of the vague year as the common year of the country; which, indeed, is rendered probable by the circumstance that they had mostly adopted the Egyptian religion . . . the celebrations of which were kept according to this year. When, therefore, the festivals of the Law rendered a year virtually tropical necessary, of the kind either restored or instituted at the Exodus, it seems most probable that the current vague year was fixed under Moses. If this supposition be correct, we should expect to find that the 14th day of Abib, on which fell the full moon of the Passover of the Exodus, corresponded to the 14th day of Phaenoth on Thursday April 21st, in the year B.C. 1652. . . . It must be borne in mind that the inferences from the celebration of the great Passover also led us to about the same time."

I will observe, in reply, that, in the first place, there is no reason for believing that the civil year which the Jews observed after the Captivity was at

If the date of the Israelitish conquest of Palestine be rightly referred to the end of the fourteenth century before Christ, it is evident that the monuments of the Egyptian kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties give us very interesting historical and geographical information relative to Palestine and its inhabitants for a considerable time anterior to Moses. This information is of course fragmentary in itself, and often of subordinate interest in the Egyptian text which happens to contain it. It may not interest the ordinary reader to know that the town of Sharuhen,<sup>24</sup> which after the conquest was assigned to the tribe of Simeon, and whose exact place on the map has hitherto been unknown, may now be proved to have been situated to the south of Gaza, close to the Egyptian frontier, and to have been in existence with the same name in the eighteenth century before Christ. It may not, perhaps, be important to know that the children of Heth, whose contract with the patriarch Abraham is preserved in the book of Genesis, after having vainly resisted the progress of the great Ramses and his predecessors, were parties to a treaty with him, of which a copy is still in existence, and from

all known before the Captivity. Secondly, there are no means of ascertaining the exact length of any Hebrew month or year before the Captivity. The data for exact calculation are therefore wholly wanting. Thirdly, there is not a particle of resemblance between the Egyptian and the Hebrew months or years which might lead one to believe the latter derived from the former, or in any way connected with them; nor does the possible observation of the Egyptian vague year by the idolatrous Hebrews help to settle the question whether Moses introduced a perfectly new kind of year or continued an older. Fourthly, if Moses really "fixed the current vague year," why may not the "first month" so fixed have been Thoth (or indeed any other) as well as Phamenoth?

Mr. Poole's "inferences from the celebration of the great Passover" are not less astounding than those already cited. Because it is said that the Passover in the time of Josiah exceeded all the Passovers from the times of the Judges and of Samuel, and all those in the days of the kings of Israel and Judah, Mr. Poole tells us, "these Passovers can scarcely have been greater in sacrifices than at least one in Solomon's reign, nor is it likely that they are mentioned as characterised by greater zeal than any others whatever; so that we are almost driven to the idea of some relation to chronology." This relation he assumes to be connected with the Sabbatical system; and as he does not seem to consider it necessary to prove that Sabbatical years were observed and reckoned through the long period in which the Law was in abeyance, he at once concludes: "This result would place the Exodus in the middle of the seventeenth century B.C."

<sup>24</sup> Jos. xix. 6. It is first mentioned in the inscription of Aahmes, son of Abna. Its position is determined by a passage in the annals of Thothmes III., who passed through it on leaving Egypt in his way to Gaza. The possessions of the tribe of Simeon were "within the inheritance of the children of Judah" (Jos. xix. 1). The inheritance of Judah included "Gaza, with her towns and her villages, as far as the river of Egypt" (Jos. xvi. 47). The Itinerary of Antoninus counts six days' journey between Gaza and Pelusium, viz. 1. Gaza—Raphia; 2. Raphia—Rhinocorura; 3. Rhinocorura—Ostracine; 4. Ostracine—Casium; 5. Casium—Pentascænus; 6. Pentascænus—Pelusium. Titus accomplished the same distance (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 11) in five days.



which we learn that their king Chetasar was the son of the king Maursar, and grandson of the king Sepululu, and that he succeeded his brother Mautnur. This brother, we are told, had himself been at war, and had made treaties with the king of Egypt, and had afterwards perished by a violent death. But it surely is not uninteresting to see the pictures in which these children of Heth are accurately represented in their national costume and warlike paraphernalia; to learn what gods they worshipped, what language they spoke; and to know for certain that they were not unacquainted with writing,—an art which many otherwise well-informed scholars consider to be more recent than the time of Moses. Nor is it uninteresting to know that the language of the whole country, for centuries before the coming of the Israelites, was identical with Hebrew;<sup>25</sup> that even “El,” the Hebrew name of God, is found, as in later times, in the composition of geographical names, like “Beth-el,” “Hor-el;” that artificial roads were already in existence; that Damascus, Hamath, and Aradus were already flourishing and powerful communities, as well as Nineveh and Babel; that another city, of first-rate importance, bore the name of Kadesh;<sup>26</sup> and that the plain of Mageddo, which occupies so prominent a place in the military history of the country, in medieval and modern, as well as in Jewish, times, was already the scene of a great battle between Thothmes III. and a powerful confederacy of all the Syrian cities.

The evidence which proves the late arrival of the Philistines on the coast of Palestine gives rise to an interesting speculation. The Philistines, as we have seen, first appear in history about 1300 years before the Christian era, as emigrants from the isles of the Mediterranean. The same cause apparently which had led to their migration produced the migrations of several *other* races which make their appearance on the Egyptian and Syrian coasts under exactly the same circumstances. Now migrations of this kind are generally the result of the pressure from behind of more energetic races; and if we ask what races can be supposed to have invaded the isles of the Mediterranean about 1300 or 1350 years B.C.,

<sup>25</sup> See M. de Rougé, *Etude sur divers monumens du règne de Toutmès III.*

<sup>26</sup> I take this opportunity of calling the attention of Egyptologists to the fact that a *circle* (in Coptic *hot*) is very repeatedly found as a determinative (evidently of *sound*) in hieroglyphic groups beginning with the first character of the city Kadesh. See Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, ii. 100, *three times*; 115 g; 121; 125, line 207; 126; 142, *three times*. See also the lately discovered stele of Thothmes III., line 9. This seems to me a new and important proof of the phonetic value of the disputed character. I believe the *circle* to be the origin of the *vase*, which at a later period occupied its place. Compare the two determinatives of the group *shen-nu*, signifying a *circle*.

and forced the Philistines and others to migrate, it is clear that probabilities are strongly in favour of the Hellenic races. Whatever exceptions may be taken to the date, or even the reality of particular facts admitted by K. Ottfried Müller, there is no room for doubting the existence of Hellenic, and particularly of Doric, civilisation in Crete and other islands at a period considerably anterior to the Homeric poems. Although, therefore, we are unable positively to assert that the Philistines were driven from their insular abodes by Doric or other Hellenic settlers, and forced to take refuge on the coast of Palestine, whence they dislodged a Canaanitish population less warlike than themselves; this is at least a very probable hypothesis. And if this hypothesis be admitted, the remarkable conclusion will follow, that the destinies of Israel at a most momentous epoch of its history were affected by the migrations of the Hellenic race.

If from Egypt and Western Asia we turn to the extreme east of the Asiatic continent, we shall find indisputable traces of a civilisation scarcely, if at all, inferior in antiquity to that of Egypt. The learned Chinese are themselves undecided as to the exact amount of credibility which is to be assigned to the earliest portion of their history. All, however, are agreed in acknowledging the authenticity and credibility of their annals from the time of the Emperor Yao, who reigned 2357 years before the Christian era.

The Jesuit missionaries, to whom we are indebted for the earliest authentic detailed accounts of the Chinese empire, were thoroughly persuaded of the remote antiquity of the civilisation of which they were witnesses.<sup>27</sup> Dr. Greswell expresses his astonishment that Father Gaubil, who was so intimately convinced of the truth of Scripture, should maintain the truth of a chronology which he (Dr. Greswell) is unable to reconcile with Scripture chronology. But Father Gaubil would certainly have thought that the statements of Scripture ought to be interpreted in accordance with incontrovertible facts rather than with assumptions about the equinoxes at the time of the Creation, or with chronological data furnished by the miracle at Ajalon. There is no such thing, in fact, as

<sup>27</sup> See Father Amiot's dissertation, "L'Antiquité des Chinois prouvée par les Monumens," in the second volume of the "Mémoires concernant les Chinois, par les Missionnaires de Pékin;" and compare it with that of Father Cibot in the first volume of the same collection; and Father de Maillac's "Lettres à M. Fréret," introductory to the "Histoire générale de la Chine." See also, among other books, "Y-king, antiquissimus Sinarum liber, quem ex Latina interpretatione P. Regis aliorumque ex Soc. Jesu P.P. edidit Julius Mohl."



'Scripture chronology,' as the term is generally understood. Every scheme of 'Scripture chronology' that has hitherto appeared is the result of a combination between data derived from passages of Scripture as interpreted by the chronologist, and other data derived from more or less authentic facts of *profane* history. It is quite clear that schemes which have been drawn up without reference to the facts either of Egyptian or Chinese chronology may readily be expected to clash with those facts. But this is no reason for saying, *tant pis pour les faits*.

It is indeed impossible to have better vouchers for the authenticity of the peculiar kind of evidence on which Chinese chronology depends than the Jesuit Fathers Regis, de Maillac, Martini, Cibot, Amiot, and Gaubil on the one hand, and astronomers like Laplace and Biot on the other. The writings of Father Gaubil in particular have been subjected by M. Biot to the minutest and severest investigation, for the purpose of selecting materials for the history of Chinese astronomy. All the translations of Father Gaubil which have been verified have, without exception, been found accurate. The originals of many of his authorities have been discovered by M. Stanislas Jullien, who has furnished M. Biot with others not less important. The learned French astronomer published the results of his investigations in the *Journal des Savans* of 1840.<sup>28</sup> One of the most interesting of these results is the discovery that the twenty-eight Nakshatras of the Indian astronomy were borrowed from the Sieu of the Chinese, at an epoch not earlier than the year 1100 B.C. This result was at once accepted by Lassen, one of the most learned and sagacious writers on Indian antiquities; but it has since been contested by Weber, whose authority in the same department is also great, and whose objections are repeated by many who are quite indifferent to the credit of the Nakshatras, and are merely glad to have reasons for rejecting dates embarrassing to their historical prejudices. M. Biot has published a reply to these objections, in a new series of articles on the History of Chinese Astronomy,<sup>29</sup> in the *Journal des Savans* for 1861, which are of a nature to settle the question for ever.

The first objection is that, 213 years before Christ, all the astronomical, philosophical, and historical literature of China was destroyed during the persecution of letters by the Emperor

<sup>28</sup> See also another essay by the same author, "Sur les Nacshatras, ou Mansions de la Lune selon les Hindous," in the *Journal des Savans* of 1845.

<sup>29</sup> "Précis de l'Histoire de l'Astronomie Chinoise." These different essays have been published in a separate form. See also a letter of M. Biot to Benfey, in the latter's *Orient und Occident*, 1862, p. 747; and the note of the Editor.

Thsin-shi-hoang-ti, and that all documents, therefore, professing to be anterior to that date must be regarded as forgeries. The second is, that the astronomical data contained in such documents are either of no consequence, or are the results of retrospective calculation.

Both these objections are<sup>e</sup> futile, and they disappear on the slightest attempt at verification.

There is not a single competent scholar who believes that the persecution under Thsin-shi-hoang-ti, which lasted only a few years, was successful in destroying the whole historical and other classical literature. It might almost as reasonably be maintained on *à priori* grounds that the pagan emperors had succeeded in destroying every copy of the Christian Scriptures. In the first place, the persecuting Chinese emperor made a distinct exception in behalf of the historical documents relating to his own family. Father Gaubil, who was acquainted with these documents, and has left extracts from them, tells us that "if we had nothing else but these annals of the Thsin, we could ascertain the epochs of most of the emperors and of the principal tributary princes from the Emperor Siouenwang, of the Tcheu dynasty, whose reign begins in 827, down to the year 206, when the Han dynasty commences; because during the whole of this interval the princes of the Thsin constantly had affairs to transact with the emperors and the tributary princes, and the contemporary historians of the Thsin kept a record of these events, and noted them down in the current year of their prince." To this M. Biot adds, that "many historical documents which were found after the burning of the books, and which go much farther back than the annals of the Thsin, are in perfect accordance in those parts which are common to them, and gain from this consent a fair presumption of fidelity for the more ancient parts. Add to this, numerous observations of solar eclipses mentioned in these annals, with precise dates of days, and you will have the extent of the materials with which Gaubil has been able to reconstruct the Chinese chronology for the whole duration of the historical times; that is, as far back as twenty-four centuries before the Christian era."

Two of the most important Chinese books anterior to the persecution of letters are the Shu-king and the Shi-king of Confucius. These books are not properly the work of the Chinese legislator; they are collections of documents, some of them of very remote antiquity, which were simply put together in chronological order, without the least attempt to modernise or in any way modify their phraseology or style. The materials of the Shu-king are historical; the Shi-king is a col-



lection of poetical compositions relating to the events of the day, sometimes a thousand years before the time of Confucius. The authenticity of these documents, and their contemporaneousness with the events to which they relate, from the year 2357 B.C. to 621, are considered by all competent judges as beyond a question.

These documents represent successive stages of the language; the first and last differing from each other as widely, according to M. Stanislas Jullien, as the language of the Rig-Veda from that of the Ramayana, and they contain notices of astronomical phenomena, the reality of which, at the alleged dates, can be verified by any European astronomer.

The importance of eclipses and other definite astronomical phenomena as chronological data can only be denied by ignorant persons. When Biot distinctly asserts that certain phenomena imply a determinate date, it is no sufficient reply to say that mathematicians often differ in such calculations. Biot is not more infallible in his calculations than any other man; but some definite error of his must be pointed out before the learned world will admit that he has in fact been mistaken.

But what if these astronomical data be themselves forgeries? M. Biot, and Father Gaubil before him, had they been so disposed, might have drawn up fictitious annals for twenty thousand years containing irreproachable astronomical data. Why may not the Chinese have calculated certain astronomical data, and fitted them into their annals, so as to suit their imaginary chronology? Simply because they could not. Even Father Gaubil is inaccurate when he speaks of the Chinese calculating eclipses. Eclipses cannot be calculated without a certain amount of mathematical knowledge, of which there is evidence that the Chinese were completely ignorant. We have abundance of positive evidence of their purely empirical methods, and also of errors which imply the ignorance of real science. For calculating eclipses, that is, being able to predict them, or calculate them backwards for long periods, "it is necessary," M. Biot observes, "to know, not only the variability of the proper motions of the sun and moon, but also the laws of the principal inequalities which result from this variability; two classes of phenomena, of which Sse-mathsien and his fellow-worker Lo-hia-hong were evidently ignorant. For they, and all Chinese astronomers for a long time after them, supposed the motions of the sun and moon to be entirely uniform. Nor were the Chinese astronomers, at any time, able with certainty to make such a calculation, because they have never well known spherical trigonometry."

M. Biot thinks it possible that, by dint of long practical observations carefully noted down, they may have been able, for short intervals, empirically to foresee eclipses of the moon, and perhaps even of the sun. But to calculate eclipses which took place centuries before their time, was as utterly beyond their power, as it is now beyond that of the best classical or Sanskrit scholar who has not learnt how to perform the operation.

Much of the evidence collected by M. Biot is of such a nature, that the original witness could not possibly have suspected the use to which his testimony would be applied. There is an observation, for instance, simply giving the lengths of the days and nights, as marked by the clepsydra at the equinoxes and solstices. To verify this observation, the astronomer has to take account of the latitude of Lo-yang, and the obliquity of the ecliptic at the supposed date of the observation.

The Chinese astronomers, from their ignorance of scientific astronomy, have often simply repeated the assertions of their predecessors; and thus committed errors, which had only become such in process of time, but were strict truths at the time of the authorities which they followed. They were ignorant for a long time of the precession of the equinoxes and solstices; and the authors of an astronomical treatise about 86 A.D. point out the error of their predecessors, who twenty years before had placed the winter solstices in a wrong division of the heavens—the twentieth instead of the nineteenth. But it was not observed till the third century after Christ, that a text of Tcheu-kong (1100 B.C.) placed the winter solstice in the second degree of the twenty-first division of the heavens, whereas, according to the Shu-king, the solstice was in the twenty-second division in the time of the Emperor Yao, more than 2300 years before Christ. Now if the Chinese were ignorant of the precession of the solstitial points until the third century, they could not long before this have forged the very documents from which the precession was inferred, and the astronomical data of which agree so accurately with their historical chronology.

The text of the Shu-king just mentioned gives the places of the two solstices and the two equinoxes in the four divisions of the heavens which they occupied in the time of the Emperor Yao. Father Gaubil, in a note on this text, says: "This proves Yao to have reigned more than 2100 or 2200 years before Jesus Christ."<sup>30</sup> His editor, M. de Guignes, who had an absurd theory on the origin of the Chinese, rather

<sup>30</sup> Le Chou-King, traduit et enrichi de notes par feu le P. Gaubil; revu et corrigé, &c. par M. de Guignes, p. 6.



foolishly adds : " Il paraît difficile de croire que du temps de ce prince on eut acquis de si grandes connoissances." Knowledge which might be difficult for M. de Guignes to acquire by mathematical calculation would not be so difficult in Yao's reign to acquire by mere observation.

M. Biot has carefully verified the statement of the Shu-king, and found it to agree exactly with astronomical truth 2357 years before Christ, in the latitude of the city of Sigan-fu, where the Emperor Yao resided. One of his conclusions is as follows :<sup>31</sup> " These data of the Emperor Yao cannot be inventions of Confucius. For in his time, about five centuries before the Christian era, the four cardinal points of the sun's path no longer occupied the divisions Mao, Sing, Fang, Hin, in which the text of the Shu-king places them. Their continual retrograde motion had brought them into quite different divisions. The winter solstice, for instance, had left the division *Hin*, the twenty-second of our general list. It had entirely traversed the division *Nu*, the twenty-first, when Tchen-kong had found it, and from thence it had passed into the division *Nieu*, the twentieth. The three other points had followed the same motion. Now neither Confucius nor any of his contemporaries would have been capable of reproducing the past by a retrospective calculation which the astronomers of the Han would themselves have been incapable of making for their own time. Confucius has, therefore, simply reported these ancient positions of the cardinal points as recognised at the time of Yao, because he found them attested in memoirs which he judged authentic, and which had been transmitted to him."<sup>32</sup>

We have, in fact, no more reason for doubting the authenticity of the Chinese annals since the time of the Emperor Yao than we have for doubting the authenticity of the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides. At all events, sceptics are bound to solve the difficulties which M. Biot has elaborately explained, and to produce objections more convincing than those which have hitherto been put forth.

" Il est vrai," says Father Du Halde,<sup>33</sup> " que cette chronologie paroît trop longue à des savans d'Europe, qui ont intérêt de la rendre plus courte : mais comment abrégér des temps

<sup>31</sup> Journal des Savans, 1861, p. 609.

<sup>32</sup> Compare Gaubil's Observations sur le Chou-King, p. 367.

<sup>33</sup> Description de l'Empire de la Chine, tom. i. p. 261. Father Amiot (*Antiquité des Chinois*, p. 147) says: " J'ajoute pour dernière conclusion, que ceux qui ont combattu les annales chinoises l'ont fait, les uns avec les armes de la chicane, les autres sans connaissance de cause et sur de faux exposés ; un petit nombre pour pouvoir établir des systèmes sur leurs débris ; et la foule pour le seul plaisir de contredire, en déprimant, autant qu'il était en eux, une nation qu'ils croyoient que d'autres ont trop louée."

qui gênent et qui ébranlent leur système sans en avoir des raisons plausibles? Et quelle raison pourroit on apporter, qui contentât les Chinois de retrancher un endroit plutôt qu'un autre, d'une histoire toujours suivie, et qui ne se dément en rien depuis le commencement jusqu'à la fin?"

The learned Jesuit then addresses himself to the objection which Catholics might draw from the supposed chronology of the Vulgate: "Si elle a de la peine, ce semble, à s'accorder avec la Vulgate, elle s'accorde aisément avec les Septantes, dont la version autorisée dans l'Eglise durant plus de six siècles, fut approuvée dans le cinquième Concile, de même que la Vulgate a été approuvée dans le Concile de Trente: et il est certain que ni dans l'une ni dans l'autre de ces assemblées célèbres on n'a nullement prétendu confirmer ces chronologies."

When great and flourishing empires are found, long before 2000 B.C.,<sup>34</sup> in parts of the earth so distant as Egypt and China, it is natural to conclude that other branches of the human family were neither small nor inactive. None, however, have left records which enable us to discover chronological landmarks in their primitive history similar to those discoverable in Egyptian or Chinese history. The Phœnician annals are lost; the great Assyrian inscriptions, whose chronology is certain, though far more ancient and authentic than the earliest Greek authorities, are comparatively modern. They only begin at a time when the glory of the Egyptian monarchy had already passed away. Older monuments have indeed been discovered; and I am far from denying the possibility of future discoveries which may enable us to establish, with absolute certainty, the chronology of the kings who reigned in remote times in the plains of the Euphrates. I only speak of results attainable at present.

There is certainly much more to be hoped for in the way of tangible chronological results from the decipherment of the Cuneiform inscriptions than from the study of the oldest Sanskrit literature. All that the most learned and acute scholars<sup>35</sup> can accomplish here is to distinguish between literary

<sup>34</sup> There can be no doubt that the use of writing at so early a period arrested the progress of the Egyptian and the Chinese languages, and prevented their arriving at the inflectional stage. The languages have indeed undergone considerable changes, but the types have remained unchanged. The peculiar kind of writing, too, adopted in both cases, was singularly calculated to prevent those internal changes which are so common in Indo-European and Semitic words. It is an interesting question, how far the intellectual growth of a nation is affected by the fact that its language, the organ of thought, has become stationary?

<sup>35</sup> See Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, i. 735 et sqq.; also Max Müller's *Hist. of Sanskrit Literature*.



periods of undetermined length, to which again periods of religious and political history correspond. The oldest fact of a known date to which we can refer in Indian chronology is the occurrence of Sanskrit names given to articles of Phœnician commerce in the time of Solomon,<sup>36</sup> which prove the presence of the Aryas in India, *perhaps* as far as the Malabar coast. The earliest hymns of the Rig-Veda must have been composed at an epoch very considerably anterior to this; but the epoch itself, for want of definite measures of time, will be estimated very differently by different judges. It cannot reasonably be placed later than fourteen or fifteen centuries before Christ; and it is important to bear in mind that the grammatical forms, even of the earliest hymns, when compared with other Indo-European forms, prove that the language had already suffered a considerable amount of phonetic decay.

The strong resemblances and contrasts between the Vedic language and religion and the Zend language and religion prove the common origin of the Indian Aryas and the people of Iran, and their existence as one people at a period at once considerably anterior to the earliest Vedic hymns, and considerably posterior to their separation from that undivided Indo-European family of which comparative philology reveals to us not only the existence, but the geographical limits, and not a few of the religious, domestic, and social features. But here again chronological data fail us as completely as in the primitive history of the Semitic family, or of that remarkable Cushite race which the Baron d'Eckstein has shown to have played so important a part in the primitive history of civilisation.

P. LE P. R.

<sup>36</sup> 1 (3) Kings viii. 21. I must not, however, allow the assertion to pass, that the names given to *apes*, *peacocks*, *ivory*, and *algum-trees* are not Hebrew, but Sanskrit, without remarking that two of these names are at least as much Egyptian as Sanskrit. *Koph*, an ape, is as close to the Egyptian *kaf* (found on the most ancient monuments, see Leps. *Denk.* ii. pl. 36, *b*) as to the Sanskrit *kapi*; and the singular of *habbim*, elephants, is as close to the Egyptian *ab* as to the Sanskrit *ibha*. I do not know whether there is any relationship between *ibha* (which is found in the Rig-Veda) and *ab*, but the latter may have been introduced from another language into the Egyptian. It occurs in the texts, among the tributes paid by the people of Kush.

DÖLLINGER ON HEATHENISM AND JUDAISM.<sup>1</sup>

DR. DÖLLINGER's portrait of Heathenism and Judaism is a photograph, not a picture. There is no theory in the book; it is a concourse of facts that seem to arrange themselves by their own specific gravity. To readers, while reading, the author of the book is nothing; he allows himself to be neither heard nor seen. It is only after reflection that they will be forced to acknowledge that from henceforth all students of the ancient religions will be compelled to be, in some sort, disciples of Dr. Döllinger. He has collected a mass of information which only German learning and industry could have brought together; so much is visible to every one. But the extraordinary art of arrangement which has put all the atoms together so as to form the most lucid of expositions, without allowing the hand of the artificer to leave a trace, is only clear after consideration. Dr. Döllinger's readers will be rewarded by obtaining a knowledge of facts, which the lifetime of an ordinary man would scarcely suffice to collect. A further study would reward them with glimpses of a method which is worth more than all the erudition of which it is the soul.

Mr. Darnell has done good service in giving us a scholar-like and even elegant translation of this great work. To this labour he has added one even more tedious, for which Dr. Döllinger himself, and not only the English reader, owes him some gratitude. He has painfully verified, one by one, the vast mass of 2912 quotations and references; and, as would naturally be expected, he has rectified not a few. The only thing for which we are disposed to blame him is the title-page, which is his own, and not Dr. Döllinger's. The original title is, *Heathenism and Judaism A Porch to the History of Christianity*. Like most figurative and poetical phrases, it implies more than it says. It says only that this book on Heathenism and Judaism is the *introduction* to the history of the Church, which Dr. Döllinger has begun to publish. But the use of the figurative "Vorhalle," instead of the ordinary "Einleitung," implies more. It may mean that architecturally the Church was a basilica to which the earlier religions formed the atrium; that whoever came to the church-doors must have previously passed through one of those passages; that both systems had in them something that anticipated, something

<sup>1</sup> The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ. By J. J. I. Döllinger, D.D. Translated by the Rev. N. Darnell. London: Longmans.



that prepared the way for, Christianity ; that not the Church, but the steps up to the Church were built with stones cut from those quarries. But one thing which the title certainly does not imply is that the book will tell us any thing of Gentile and Jew "in the courts of the Temple of Christ." It describes the Gentile and the Jew, not inside those courts, but outside them ; not as they were after they had undergone the transforming influence of Christianity, or as they might appear to Christian eyes, but as they were before Christianity had come to transform them. It describes the two religions not so much as a positive anticipation of Christianity by what they possessed, as a proclamation of some great need by their misery and their want. *Abyssus abyssum invocat*,—such is the moral of the work ; the depth of human indigence is calling to the depth of God's beneficence. The book does not give us a picture of a development ; it does not show us a seed, planted in the dunghill of Heathenism, pruned by the sacrificial knives of Judaism, and growing into the sacred tree of Christianity ; it does not display the type foreshadowing the anti-type, but only the void, helplessly opening its mouth and desperately drawing in its breath to inhale the pleroma of Redemption.

Not that the book leaves on the mind no impressions and suggestions of such a development of Gentilism through Judaism into Christianity. It is a quarry that has its lessons for every geologist who visits it. But the quarry is not answerable for the geologists' theories, which may be false, while the facts on which they are built remain infallibly true. It is one thing to say, These are the facts which we find in Heathenism, and these in Judaism ; and another to say, Hence we see that Heathenism is the ruin of a primitive religion, which Judaism partly restored, partly reformed, and partly left as it was, in consideration of the hardness of men's hearts (as in the permission of divorce, which was a corruption of the primitive law, and "in the beginning was not so"), till Christianity grew up, fulfilling all the symbols, and explaining all the enigmas, of the two former systems ; correcting the corruptions of the one, and completing the shortcomings of the other ; and giving religion a place in reason, in society, in politics, by furnishing the data for the complete reconciliation of faith, morals, science, and jurisprudence. If the Old Testament had come down to us as the code of a strange religion, instead of a text-book of our own, we should have been more willing to recognise its relations with the documents of the old religions of heathenism, among which it holds a place like that of the creed and canons of the Church among

the heresies which divided the Christian world. In the Bible we have four periods of religion : the primitive religion, gradually corrupted till it was finally crushed into fragments by the confusion of Babel ; the patriarchal faith, preserved by certain families, but without any recognised organisation till the time of Moses ; the Mosaic reform, which instituted a people to be the preservers and witnesses of the old tradition, and at the same time introduced into it a principle of growth and development destined at length to transform it ; and finally, the triumph of this transformation in the new creation of Christianity.

Of the first two periods we have only fragmentary knowledge. Their history has to be reconstructed out of the religions of the Confusion, compared with the documents of Genesis. The idea of their religion was the worship of the Creator, manifesting Himself in the great works of the physical universe. The reform which Moses was commissioned to introduce into this primeval system was only a partial one ; he weakened, but did not destroy, the physical and material aspect of religion. Judaism was a step in the religious development of mankind, but not the term of that development. One of its chief designs was to give a moral tendency to the elemental and material religions of primitive man. Thus the system as founded by Moses, and developed by the prophets, became the model and provocative of a reform afterwards attempted by the philosophers and legislators of the heathen, who sought to get rid of the merely material meaning of religious myths, and of their cynical immorality, by withdrawing religious speculation from the sphere of the material world, and assigning to it the sphere of ethics, and by giving the mythical physics a moral aspect, by means of a system of moral and mystical interpretation. Judaism was thus a transitional system, containing both the husk of the old, and the germ of the new order. When the seed suddenly grew up into Christianity, the old husk was broken to pieces and completely cast off, the last remains of the elemental precepts were cancelled, and religion became entirely moral and metaphysical, without retaining a single fibre of physical speculation among its essential constituents. This progress of the primitive Gentilism through Judaism to Christianity may be traced in several particulars, from which we will select three—the name and definition of God, the doctrine of the seven great demiurgic forces, and the doctrine of sacrifice.

I. Primitive religion, like primitive language and primitive philosophy, was obliged to find expression in material images. Man is a self-conscious spontaneous force ; he feels



himself to be a spirit, but he has no way of expressing his spiritual consciousness except in terms of his sensations. Soul cannot display itself; it is only through the play of the features, the words that proceed out of the mouth, and the acts which the hands perform, that we catch glimpses of our neighbour's inner existence. The reason soon catches the meaning of these signs, and generalises them; but considered in themselves, the signs must, from the nature of the case, be all taken from the material world.

Thus, not only was the creation that great gift which called for all the gratitude of the newly-created man, but the created world was the only possible object of direct contemplation to him; neither his language nor his philosophy as yet enabled him to fix his thoughts and to discourse upon abstract and metaphysical verities. The immaterial spheres of God and the soul are only known to us through their products and acts; we cannot behold their substance. Indeed, no forces are known to us except through their effects. As the changes of visible things reveal to us the laws and forces of matter, so do the existence of the world, its greatness, its use, and its beauty, reveal to us the footprints of the forces or attributes of God—His power, wisdom, goodness, and beauty.

Not that the world is the image of God, any more than the shape which the mind engraves on the imagination is an image of the mind. Only a being possessing power, knowledge, and will, can be an image of the Almighty, the Allwise, and the Allgood. The world tells us what work these attributes perform, not what substance they consist of. It symbolises and represents them, but only to the rational interpreter. It expresses God, not like a picture, of which a brute might perceive the resemblance, but like a word, which only a man can understand. The notions of power, wisdom, and goodness are not an influx from the world into the mind, but a meaning which the mind lends to the world. It is not sensation, but an internal act of our own self-consciousness, that gives us the essential part of our notions of causation, intention, contrivance, purpose, and will. Hence it is only to man, not to the brute, that nature displays the action of God. The rational soul, which alone is the image of God, is alone conscious of power, knowledge, and will, and therefore only such a soul can recognise the prints of these forces in nature. This is why the vestiges of God in nature can be to the soul the food and instrument of a true religious worship.

The things perceived by the senses are the common property of mankind, and may easily, and without risk of error,

be expressed by words that all can understand. But the inner self-consciousness is an individual thing, a private and inalienable possession. A man may suspect that his neighbour feels the same feelings, and thinks the same thoughts, as himself. But it is not an easy thing at once to coin words to express these thoughts, and, after they are coined, to be sure that the person addressed should understand them in the sense meant by the speaker. Hence in the documents of the primeval religion it was easy enough to speak of the world, and the things in it; but when from these men passed on to the soul or to God, then came the knot. God might be called Spirit: but spirit is wind or breath; and when the primitive prophet says that "the Spirit moved on the waters," who could tell whether he meant that God so moved, or that a wind blew over them? Again, if we call God "Heaven," who knows whether in the expression "Heaven forbid" we express our belief in a controlling power of the stars and of the heavenly spheres, such as the Sabæans held, or whether we attribute this power to the immaterial God? If, again, like the earliest Hebrews, we only call God Elohim, 'the princes, or lords,' who can tell that the word implies any thing more than the great and mighty masses that are apparent to the senses, and whose force overcomes the weakness of men,—the sun, the earth, the sea, the rivers, the mountains, the trees, even the very beasts?

In the primeval religion, the knot appears to have been cut by giving to God first no name at all, and then a name that was entirely unintelligible, and by forbidding all inquiries into its meaning. This state of religion lasted from the time of Enos, the third from Adam, who was the first to call on the name of the Lord (Gen. iv. 26), till the time of Moses. God had made Himself known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as the Almighty God, El Shaddai; but by His name Jehova He was not known to them—that is to say, says Dr. Döllinger, "the meaning of this name was not disclosed to them." They had the name, for it is frequently used in the opening chapters of Genesis, after the first. But it was a name that they were forbidden to pronounce. Almost all pagan systems contain traces of this mode of separating God from creatures by means of an unintelligible name that was to be venerated in silence, or by the negation of any name at all. There is an unknown or nameless God acknowledged and forgotten by almost all heathens. There is the Brahm of the Brahmins; the Adi Buddha of the Buddhists; the first effigies or primal intellect of the Egyptians, whom, according to Jamblichus, they venerated in silence; the *Deus* or *Θεός* of



Romans or Greeks, whom Tertullian shows to be different from the gods of the popular mythology; the unknown god whose altar St. Paul found at Athens; "the potent one who all things swayeth," whom the author of the elder Edda "ventures not to name;" the eternal Æon of the Zoroastrians (on which point of doctrine, however, Dr. Döllinger throws some doubt); the unnamed essence of the Chinese mystics; the "Teotl," or all-in-all, of the Mexicans; the good spirit whom the North-American Indians acknowledge and neglect; the good god who was barely acknowledged by, but received no worship from, Peruvians, Slavi, Samoeides, Hottentots, and other tribes all over the world, of whom accounts may be found in Prichard's *Physical History of Man*. It is almost universal in heathendom to acknowledge a good god, but to hold also that he takes no notice of men, and that men, not being able to communicate with him, must address themselves to the secondary powers from whom they hope for good, or to the evil beings whom they dread.

Hence we may gather that the namelessness of God is one characteristic of the primitive religion. And this conclusion is drawn not only from the history of the Heathen sects, which are the ruins of this primitive religion, but from the very nature of things. In the infancy of language God could not be named by any name expressive of His essence, without direct danger of confounding Him with creatures. In Paganism this tendency became a fact. And the line of demarcation between God and creatures was gradually blotted out. If the first principle acknowledged by a Heathen sect was a creative mind, this first principle soon became confounded with chaos, wind, darkness, water, mud, earth, light, or time, by the mere force of the words by which men were compelled to define the terms "creative" and "mind." Creation became identified with procreation, mind with matter. Thus where Moses says simply, "In the beginning (bereshith) God created (bara) the heaven and the earth," Sanchoniatho lets us know of a sect half heathen, half Jewish, that dwelt about Byblus, whose version of these words was—There was one Eliun (Elohim, God) called Hypsistos (the most high), and his wife Beruth (bereshith); from them came Uranus (heaven), and his sister called Ge (earth); and from these in turn the primitive gods El, Chronos, and the rest. Thus, in Heathenism, the developments of nature become the developments of God, and cosmogony becomes theogony, because the Cosmos, or world, is the only Theos, or God. God is not the pure unchanging spirit, but only the sum of all things; all change is a continuous evolution or

emanation from his substance, and the genealogy of these successive changes becomes a theology. The primal unity dissipates itself in a series of emanations, each successive development coming nearer to man, and making a greater gulf between him and the first unity, which thus becomes more and more remote, till it is consigned to oblivion. This is the natural consequence of symbolising God by matter and not by mind. But in the infancy of language, before mind could describe itself intelligibly by symbols, it was impossible to symbolise God by mind. And to symbolise Him by matter was, as we have seen, the fruitful mother of pagan errors. Hence the only means left was to command that no name should be put upon God; that He should be symbolised by no likeness (vocal or visual) of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. The records of this command given to the primitive world are found in the dim but universal acknowledgment of an unknown God whom the heathen dared not name. The records of the transgression of the command are patent in every system of heathen idolatry.

This abstinence from all definition of God, and the worship of Him by a simple enumeration of His works, are characteristic of the first period of the childhood of religion. Premature attempts to define resulted in confounding God and the world. The first real advance was when the inner meaning of the word Jehova was revealed to the Hebrews. This was the beginning of real theology. God was no longer merely the mighty protector of Abraham, but He was defined as essential and voluntary Being: "I will be that I will be,"—the self-determining One who never changes. By such means,—first, by the absence of all definition of God, and secondly, as soon as the rude forms of language permitted it, by a definition which was purely spiritual and metaphysical, and which could not receive a merely material interpretation,—the grand distinctive fundamental view of Judaism was preserved, and a complete severance was made between God and the world. "God, pure spirit and creator, brought forth the world, both as to matter and form, through the almighty power of His will, all nature containing nothing which could be looked upon as His image and likeness." This definition contained the germ of all true philosophy. Without it, Plato could never have written; even with it, he was not able entirely to separate himself from the pagan tradition, and never succeeded in entirely severing God from the world.

But though Judaism began this reform of religion, it could not perfect it; "the Hebrew language was too little abstract



to furnish the requisite terms for metaphysical explanations of the being of God ;” and the Scriptures often use anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions of God, all capable of abuse by a carnal mind. It was only Christianity, speaking through the abstract and precise medium of the languages of Europe, Greek and Latin, that was able to perfect the reform for which Moses could only prepare the way.

II. The smaller the space occupied in the primitive religion by speculation on God’s nature, the greater was the range of the contemplation of His works. The first chapter of Genesis, which may be taken as the most perfect expression of the primitive creed, is entirely occupied with them. The Elohim in the beginning creates heaven and earth, the invisible and the visible worlds ; but the earth, the visible universe, becomes a dead chaos of dark waters ; then the spirit of God begins to move on these waters, and to renew the face of the earth. Six great phases of development stand forth, all growing from darkness into light, from nothingness into being. These are called days, and they are made up of two elements, called evening and morning, or conception and birth. The first of these is called the one day, because all the others are, as it were, branches from it. After these six days of development comes a seventh of rest, when the productivity of the forces of the universe ceases, and God alone is exalted. In the Jewish ritual the six days had already lost their significance, and only the seventh was observed. This was commemorated both by the weekly Sabbath and by the Sabbatical year. The six phases of the creation, however, were symbolised, along with the seventh of rest, by the seven-branched candlestick ; and all together were called by Solomon the seven pillars on which Wisdom had built her house. Later on, in the Book of Tobias, we find the seven primeval angels mentioned, who in later Jewish tradition appear as the seven angels who were created in the beginning, and who minister before God within the veil. From the Jews the first Christians received this tradition ; and in Hermas we find the six creative days as six young men, who build the tower of the Church, and who are “the angels of God who were first created, to whom the Lord delivered His whole creation, to found, to build up, and to govern.” Of these “first created” we find the fullest mention, as we might expect, in the Alexandrian writers. Clement gives us extracts from a Christian writer named Theodotus, who, even in his day, was reckoned ancient, and who wrote about them. Clement himself without hesitation identifies them with the days of Moses, and with all the other creative hebdomads to which the production of nature and the world

was referred in the heathen systems. "They are," he says, "the presidents of the planets, the first hebdomad by which the operations of nature are performed." They are "the seven first-begotten archons of angels, who have the greatest might; the seven planets which administer the earth; the seven Pleiades; the seven stars of the great and little Bear."

The largest part of the religious ceremonial of the Jews was based upon this cosmical doctrine. This we are distinctly told by St. Paul (Heb. ix. 1-10); by the author of the Book of Wisdom (xviii. 24); by Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* iii. c. 7, § 7), who follows Philo; by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* v.), who says of the tabernacle, "the four veils are the four elements; the altar of incense is the exhaling earth in the midst of the world. The candlestick represents the motion of the seven planets, with the sun in the midst of them." This is the shell or husk of Judaism, the cosmical element which is inherited from the older paganism, and was destined to be abolished by Christianity. The law, says St. Paul (Gal. iv. 3), was the service of the elements of the universe. It commemorated the forces of nature, weak and poor in comparison of the spiritual forces of Christianity; and its service consisted in the observation of "days, and months, and seasons, and years" (Gal. iv. 9, 10), of "new moons and sabbaths" (Col. ii. 16); in making distinction between pure and impure things, and in prescribing concerning them, "touch not, taste not, handle not" (Col. ii. 20-22);—which were only temporary precepts, destined to be swept away by Christianity, which was to withdraw men's eyes from the material world, and to fix them upon the soul; to teach men to contemplate God in His relations not so much to nature as to man; and in some measure to change the worship of the Creator into the worship of the Redeemer.

This transition is exhibited to us by St. John in the first part of the great cycle of visions beginning with the fourth chapter of the Apocalypse. First the vision exhibits the Jewish worship; God sits on His throne, encircled by the seven-coloured bow of creative light,—the Noachic symbol of the force which preserves the world,—and surrounded by the twenty-four representatives of the Jewish priesthood. From the throne, as from Sinai of old, proceed thunders and voices; before it burn the seven lamps, or the seven spirits of God. In front is the crystal sea, the laver of the temple. Within the throne are the cherubs of the mercy-seat and of Ezechie's vision, who sing the hymn heard by Isaiah,—Holy, holy, holy. And the four-and-twenty elders of the Jewish priesthood fall down and worship God, "because *He created* all things, and for His pleasure they were, and were created."



When the word "created" sounds, a book is seen in God's hand, written within and without, sealed with seven seals. This is the created universe, sealed with the impression of the septiform powers of creation. No one is found able to loose these seals, to penetrate to the hidden meaning of these hebdomads, or to loose the web of superstition which they had woven around the universal face of religion. At first the seer weeps much, "because no man was found worthy to open the book," and to deliver mankind from their bondage to the elements of the world. Then he is told not to weep, because the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, had prevailed to open the book, and to loose its seven seals. Accordingly he next sees this "Lion," like a slain Lamb, with seven horns and seven eyes, who comes and takes the book out of God's hand, and opens it. Then the former worshippers fall down, and sing a new song, not now of creation, but of redemption: "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open its seals; because Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God." And the hymn is taken up by tens of thousands of voices: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain;" and answered by every creature, in heaven, and earth, and under the earth, and in the sea: "To Him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb, blessing, and honour, and power."

This change, by which religion, once for all, got rid of the crude speculations of an astrological and magical system of physics, was not approved by the mystical sects of Judaism and Heathenism. They prided themselves upon their *gnosis*, or knowledge of the deep meanings and causes of physical things, and despised the moral and spiritual simplicity of the new religion. A few of the anti-Jewish Gnostics took advantage of this change in the Object of worship, from God as Creator to God as Redeemer, to say that Christ had abrogated the empire of the Creator or Demiurge, who had tyrannised over the Jews. This was the case with Heraclion, Saturnilus, Cerdo, and Marcion. But the great mass of Gnostics were unwilling to give up the old lore about the physical world, by means of which they considered that they had a magical power to control the operations of nature.<sup>2</sup> Hence they attempted to graft Christianity upon the old pagan worship of the mundane forces. Now the seven creative days of Moses gave them the only point where the two systems could be combined.

<sup>2</sup> This objection to Christianity was felt by all physiological pagans to whom the new religion was offered. Thus Taliesin expressed the feelings of the Druids towards the Christian missionaries. "Monks congregate like wolves. They know not when the darkness and dawn divide, nor what is the course of the wind, or the cause of its agitation." This is the kind of knowledge which the pagan priesthoods always professed to preserve.

Translating these Days into Ages (Æons), or indeterminate periods, and again abstracting from these Time-powers all notion of mere measure of duration, and leaving to them only the notion of creative or destructive forces, the Gnostics ended by making them as concrete and as personal as the Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians had made their Chronos, Saturn, and Seb. To the Gnostics, then, the seven creative days of Moses were simply the hebdomad of creative æons. Their father, Simon Magus, according to the testimony of Hippolytus, expressly founded his system on the text, "In six days God made heaven and earth, and on the seventh He rested" (*Philosophumena*, p. 166, lib. vi. § 14). To these seven æons, or demiurgic powers, many of the Gnostic sects added an eighth, either a female Sophia, who was their mother, or a material principle of fire or the like, from which they all emanated. Others of the sects (as that of Monoimus the Arab) eliminated the seventh day, as not having been productive of any thing, and so reduced the number of demiurgic æons to six. But all these numbers, seven, six, or eight, were derived from different adaptations of the Mosaic cosmogony to existing heathen traditions.

The Ophites identified the seven creative æons with the seven spirits of the planets, to each of which one of the days of the week had come to be dedicated. This appropriation of the days to the planets did not originate with the Jews. Maimonides, however (in *Mischna*), gives it great antiquity: "In the days of Enos," he says, "the sons of Adam erred, saying, 'As God created the planets to govern the world, men should honour them.'" And Philo says that many Jews, from the time of the Babylonish captivity, believed in the influence of the stars, interpreting the seven higher angels of the Presence as the spirits of the seven planets (*De Migr. Abr.* p. 415). Not a trace of the theory is to be found in Old or New Testament, or in the *Mischna* or Talmud, except that in the last Saturn is called *Sabbatai*, or Sabbath star; while according to Epiphanius, its Pharisaic name was *Hochab Sabbath*. Hence Tibullus calls the Sabbath *Saturni sacra dies*. But among whomsoever the dedication of each day of the week to a separate planet began, it is clear that those persons must have identified the primeval week with the seven planetary powers, just as the Ophites did.

Now if we take the Gnostics as genuine heirs of the old pagan traditions, the conclusion will be forced upon us, that all the series of mundane deities, similar to those of the Gnostics, which are found in the primitive pagan systems, are, like them, only corruptions and misrepresentations of the creative



days of Moses. Thus the Persians have their seven Amschaspands, Ormuzd himself being the first of them, and the other six being lords and guardians of heaven and of beasts, of fire, of metals, of the earth, of vegetables, and of moisture. The earliest Egyptian cycle of gods was a cycle of seven, as Lepsius has proved; and this cycle has been preserved in their first mythical dynasty of divine kings. Afterwards an eighth was added, and cycles of eight deities received the highest worship in several of the Egyptian nomes. But to the last the cycle of the seven gods, of whom Seb, the Time-God, was the first, was an object of popular worship. The cycle of the seven Patœci, with Esmun (the "eighth") or Asclepius at their head, was revered both at Memphis and in Syria. In India the Vedantic doctrine turns upon the creation of the world by the sacrifice of the seven Rishis or the seven Menus. The Buddhists, with whom the destruction of the world holds the same place as its creation does in other systems, attribute this destructive power to the seven Buddhas. The Babylonians worshipped the seven planetary powers, under the sovereignty of Bel; and Plato compounded his world-soul of the seven planetary spheres which rule the manifestations of nature.

The vigour with which the tradition of these numerical cycles maintained itself is surprising. The heathens seem to have thought that the number of the gods was a more important point than the choice of the gods to be numbered. All Greeks agreed that there were seven wise men, though two could hardly be found who could agree who the seven were. They clearly thought it more important that the number should be seven than that this or that man should or should not be found in the list. So with the early dynasties preserved to us by Chinese, Egyptian, Phœnician, Indian, and Babylonish writers. The number of kings is the all-important matter; the historian thinks it of small moment to be precise in giving the names, and of no moment whatever to give any account of the actions of the kings. Seven is the demiurgic number, so the creators of the state shall be seven; thus the kings of Rome are seven. So with the cycles of gods: all Greeks and Latins knew that there were twelve great gods; all Etruscans knew there were twelve consentes and nine novensiles; all Egyptians knew that the first divine dynasty consisted of seven or eight deities, but who those deities were admitted of much dispute. They agreed about the numbers, they quarrelled about the names. Pythagoras might have built his philosophy on this observation, accepting that as certain which all men agreed about, and eliminating that as doubtful which all men disputed about. So he made the

essence of Paganism, considered as the cultus of natural forces, to consist in the contemplation of pure numbers, which in some mysterious way constituted the forces which ruled the world. In this matter, the great reform introduced by Judaism was the neglect of the six demiurgic forces, and the concentration of religious regards upon that day whose history was a complete void, and which thus symbolised the rest of God. Other religions paid greater honour to the powers of the other days,—the mundane deities, whose service consisted in doing honour to the material elements over which they presided. It was as great a sin in the Persian to dishonour Sapanomad, the Amschaspand who presided over the earth, by defiling her charge, as to dishonour Ormuzd by injustice to man. So it was in all the primitive religions. Ceremonial pollutions, incurred by treading on forbidden ground, by eating forbidden fruit, by spitting into a river, or by touching a corpse, were more rigidly punished than moral crimes. Judaism, though it retained many of these isolated precepts, did away with the ground on which they rested, by abolishing all cultus of the six creative days, or æons, and attaching all religion to the observation of the vacant day, or Sabbath. There are traces in history of the anger which this excited among the heathen against the “sabbatising” Hebrews; and this, perhaps, is the cause why the originally beneficent God, to whom the Sabbath, or seventh day, was dedicated by Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans,—Seb, Chronos, Saturn,—came to inherit his evil reputation as the savage destroyer of his brothers and children. Thus the Sabbath was the first step towards the destruction of the cultus of the elements, which, according to St. Paul, was perfected by Christianity.

The detailed identification of the first numerical cycles of the gods of Heathenism with the seven days of Moses is a subject which cannot be fully treated here. Only a careful and comparative study of the elements of the ancient systems can make that identification clear and certain. Our readers must, therefore, allow us to assume this point, and to pass on to the next.

III. The connection between the numerical cycles of the mundane forces which constituted the gods of Heathenism, and the productive days of Moses, is easier to conceive than the connection between a sacrificial ritual and a cosmogonical religion. In Genesis, after the creation of heaven and earth has been briefly mentioned, we read that “the earth became a chaos, and darkness upon the faces of an abyss;” but we are told nothing about the cause of the catastrophe that had overwhelmed the newly-created earth. Then



the account of the restoration of the earth commences simply with the motion of the Spirit over the waters, and with the production of light by the Divine fiat. But if we look to other passages of the Old Testament where the course of the creation is explained, this meagre outline is filled up for us. There, God is always represented as having formed the world out of a waste of earth or waters, which was occupied by dragons, or evil spirits, who were slain and cast out by the beams of the new-created light. Thus in Job xxx. the Almighty creates the light, "that it might lay hold on the wings of the earth to shake them, and that it might shake the ungodly out of it." In Ps. lxxiv. the beginning of the creation is thus described: "Thou didst divide the sea by Thy might, Thou breakest the heads of the dragons in the waters;" and the continuance of the great work follows in the words: "Thine is the day, and Thine is the night; Thou hast created the luminary and the sun. Thou hast made the borders of the earth,—summer and winter Thou hast formed them." So in Ps. lxxxix. "Thou rulest the raging of the sea. . . . Thou hast humbled the proud one as one that is wounded; by Thy mighty arm Thou hast scattered Thine enemies. Thine are the heavens and Thine the earth; the round world and its fullness Thou hast founded; Thou hast created the north and the sea." So the account of the creation in Job xxvi. begins with the trembling of the giants under the waters; and ends with the words, "By His might He maketh the sea to tremble; by His wisdom He crusheth the dragon. His breath cleareth the sky; His hand hath created the serpent that flieth." The Hebrew tradition taught that the watery chaos, out of which the world was formed, had first to be cleared of its inhabitants, the dragon and the evil spirits. If "the Hebrew writings," as Dr. Döllinger says, "nowhere speak distinctly of a fall having occurred in the world of spirits, nor how Satan became what he was on first coming in contact with man," they insinuate that it was through his wickedness that the primitive earth had become chaos, and "subject to vanity;" and Frederick Schlegel gathers from them that the former universe was a paradise for the probation of angels, destroyed in consequence of their fall, as Adam's paradise was destroyed through his sin, and the antediluvian world through the wickedness of the "giants," and as our world one day shall be, when its wickedness is complete. This doctrine of a former world, or a succession of worlds, each destroyed in consequence of the sin of its inhabitants, is enumerated among Jewish tenets in the Dabistan, and is combated by Maimonides in the persons of two of its adherents, Rabbi Juda Bar

Simon and Rabbi Abhu (*More Nevochim*, p. 2, c. xxx.). Among the earliest Christian fathers the doctrine either of a successive or a contemporaneous plurality of worlds was generally accepted. St. Clement of Rome implies it, and his words are quoted with approval by Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, while the doctrine is expressly laid down by Origen and Jerome. The influence of Aristotle's philosophy led to its being considered a heresy, and a work attributed to Justin Martyr proves its impossibility "out of Aristotle."<sup>3</sup>

Thus to the Hebrew mind there were always two parts of a new creation. First the destruction of the enemies, or the opposing powers; and then the building up of the new order of things. These two parts of the act were connected, not merely as antecedent and consequent, but as cause and effect. The destruction of the fiends in chaos by the newly-created light was *ipso facto* the renewal of the earth; the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea was the creation of Israel as a people. The total destruction of the Canaanites was to be the *causa sine quâ non* of the preservation of the theocratic polity of Israel; and the sin of Israel threatened as dire calamities to their land as Adam's fall had involved to the primeval Paradise. If they sinned, their land should cast them forth and become a desolation, their heaven should become brass, their earth iron, their rain dust, and their fields a waste of brimstone and burning. And this calamity could only be expiated by the destruction of the sinners who had caused it.

Thus every creative act of God, after the first creation of heaven and earth out of nothing, is a renewal through destruction. Before the earth was renewed for the sons of Noah, and the curse of Adam taken away, the world had to be destroyed by the Deluge. Before Israel could be created into a people, Pharaoh had to be sacrificed in the Red Sea. Before it could have its settlement in Canaan, the Canaanites were to be exterminated. Before the Christian Church could inherit the earth, the Jews had to be reprobated, and their fall was the rise of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 11). Each renewal of the world was based upon the sacrifice of the evil-doers who held the old world in thrall, according to the law announced by the Psalmist at the end of the great cosmogonical hymn (Ps. ciii.): "Thou shalt take away Thy Spirit, and they shall cease to be; Thou shalt send forth Thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and Thou shalt renew the face of the earth."

Thus in the Jewish ritual sacrifice might have reference to that element of destruction which is found in all creation

<sup>3</sup> Migne, *Patrology*, Series Græca, tom. vi. col. 1542.



after the first; and this reference, which is only secondary in Judaism, becomes of primary consequence in the heathen systems. Their cosmogonical myths were often conceived after the image of a sacrifice, and the formation or reformation of the world was described as the death and mutilation of a living being—man, god, or animal. The former world was a sensitive being, whose death had become necessary through his defilement or decrepitude. He was therefore attacked by seven spirits, and torn limb from limb; and his members, collected in a caldron, ark, or altar, were afterwards raised to a new life,—the eyes becoming sun and moon, the flesh the earth, the blood the water, the breath the air, the bones the metals or the rocks, the hair the trees.

This immolation was sometimes violent, sometimes voluntary, sometimes both together. Thus, in the Babylonish cosmogony of Berosus, first the light kills the monstrous animals that inhabited the darkness, and next man and other animals capable of bearing the light are created by the voluntary self-mutilation of one of the gods. Many, if not most, of the heathen "mysteries" commemorated some such suffering of a god. In the Zagreus-myth of the Eleusinian mysteries the god of nature was lacerated and dismembered in order to become stars, or plants, or animals, and was ever being restored to life by the death of what he had become, only in order to go through the same process of dismemberment afresh. So it was with Osiris; so it was with Purusha, the primeval man of the Vedas. The same myth is found in Scandinavia and in Polynesia. Every where we have the restoration of the world, or the new life of nature in spring, connected with the sufferings and dismemberment of a god. Sometimes it is a battle between gods and giants, long doubtful, and at last won only with sweat and blood,—by herculean toils and sufferings. The demiurge descends into the demon-peopled chaos, and there, at the cost of his blood or his life, destroys the fiends, releases the elements from their thralldom, and clears the way for a renewal of the universe, which springs up either from his blood or from the mutilated carcasses of the giants whom he has destroyed.

The Hebrew tradition, till we come to the Evangelical predictions of the suffering Messiah, contains nothing similar to this physical suffering of a deity in the restoration of the world. But the destruction necessary for the destined renewal is often said to be a cause of moral suffering to God. Before the Deluge "He repented that He had made man, and it grieved Him to the heart." If this looks like the grief of hatred and aversion, other passages represent it as the agony

of a love yearning to save, yet obliged to destroy. St. Luke's touching picture of the Incarnate God weeping over the doomed city is anticipated in the Old Testament by the grief of God at being obliged to destroy Judah (Jerem. iv. 19-26; Isai. xv. 5, xvi. 11), and by the earnest recollection, and troubling of His bowels, when He renounces Ephraim (Jerem. xxxi. 20; Hosea xi. 8). Moses, long before, had said, "The Lord shall judge His people, and *repent Himself* for His servants,"—a repentance that always corresponded to the miseries He was obliged to inflict (Deut. xxxii. 36; Judges ii. 15, 18). And though this Divine repentance is not explicitly represented under the heathen symbol of a physical mutilation of God, such as the plucking out of His eye, or the lopping-off of His head or foot, yet the materials for some such comparison are not wanting. The rejection of His people is like plucking the signet from His hand (Jerem. xxii. 24), or like divorce from a frail wife still passionately loved (Ezek. xvi.). Israel is called the apple of God's eye; and if so, to cast off one is to pluck out the other.

An aboriginal element of the idea of sacrifice was the doctrine of substitution. Not only was the original destruction of the dragons of chaos, or the original self-mutilation of the demiurge, necessary for the making of the world, but the continued representation of these original sacrifices was necessary for its preservation. The seven creative spirits were succeeded by a choir of seven priests, who morning by morning killed a beast or a man, who was made to represent the world, tore him limb from limb, and rearranged his members on the altar; by the magic might of this sacrifice they enabled the sun to rise, kept the stars in their courses, and preserved the universe from collapse. Hence the priests that offered the heathen sacrifices became the creators and preservers of the world; their ceremonies and their self-mutilation were necessary to uphold the existing order of things; their dances, woven in imitation of the paths of sun, moon, and stars, were the means of keeping the planets in their courses; and if they were offended, they could threaten, by withholding their aid, to bring the whole universe to a standstill, and to involve the mundane gods and man in one common ruin. With the heathen these ceremonies had a necessary, a mechanical effect. The power of the sacrifice was so strong, that if it was rightly performed, no god could withstand it. It was a charm to compel the gods to do the bidding of man. The Hebrews had no such idea of the compulsory power of sacrifice over the Almighty.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The Essenes,—who were a kind of Jewish Gnostics, who claimed Moses himself as their founder, and who mixed up with the observance of the law



They had record of one sacrifice, in consequence of which God resolved never again to destroy the earth by a flood ; but this preservative force in the sacrifice was moral, not physical. "The Lord," after the sacrifice of Noah, "smelled a sweet savour, and said, I will no more curse the earth for the sake of man."

Again, among the heathen, every species of sacrifice could be renewed or repeated by substitutes. As the demiurgic power had first peopled the earth, and enriched it by pouring out his blood on it, so might the earth still be made fruitful by the blood of man ; and human sacrifices were continually offered with this intent. It was the universal notion of paganism that life was to be sought in death, and strength in destruction. The religious heathen was like a decrepit old man, seeking to regain his youth by bathing in the blood of children. Where the modern would seek to increase life by developing to the utmost all that lives, the ancient world killed a part; that its scattered life might enhance the worth of the residue.

With regard to substitution, Judaism introduced great reforms into the doctrine of sacrifice. Sacrifice was either the destruction of the sinner who held the world in thrall, or the self-immolation of the voluntary victim dying to give life to man. In the first sense, every capital punishment among the Jews was a human sacrifice, as when Samuel hewed Agag in pieces "before the Lord;" or when the law declared that the sinner should be cut off, in order that the land might not "spue out" the people; or when Achan, through whose sacrilege disaster had come upon Israel, was stoned and burned with his family and goods, and a great heap of stones was raised over the ashes, in order to "turn away the Lord from the fierceness of His anger" (Joshua vii.). In cases of smaller transgression the man was allowed to expiate his offence by offering the life of an animal instead of his own; and the permission of this substituted expiation proves the sacrificial and expiatory character of the death of the sinner when no substitute was accepted, and he had to die for his own sin. But the Jewish law absolutely forbade the substitution of one man for another; each man had to bear his own iniquity,—*"the soul that sinneth, it shall die."* The only human sacrifice it permitted was the death of the sinner for his own sin. And, on the other hand, the self-immolation of the Divine victim was kept in the background, obscurely commemorated in history by the interrupted sacrifice of Isaac, but not so directly represented by any of the certain pre-Mosaic opinions,—used to employ prayer in order to compel the sun to rise. *Döllinger*, ii. 314.

nary sacrifices of the ritual as to be intelligible to the witnesses of it. Among the heathen this kind of sacrifice had led to horrible abuses. It had become a kind of magical ceremony, which forced the gods to do what they were asked. It made men seek for life, not in doing good to their neighbour, but in offering him up as a sacrifice in their own stead. It was the foundation of half the superstitions and cruelties of paganism. The Judaic reform, therefore, threw this aspect of sacrifice into the background for a time, till its heathen significance was forgotten, and then it was again renewed by Psalmists and Prophets in their picture of the suffering Messiah, whose woes were to bring about the conversion of the heathen, and to cause all the kindreds of the Gentiles to adore the true God.

Part of the Mosaic reform was to change the significance of sacrifice,—to give it a moral instead of a physical meaning, a spiritual instead of a cosmical influence. Sacrifice was no longer a mere medicine to give strength to the arm, clearness to the head, fertility to the soil, or success to the enterprise; but by its sacrifices of expiation—the burnt-offering, the meat and drink offerings, and those of thanksgiving—it became a provision for the principal needs of all religious life,—the destruction of sin, and the effacing of that guilt which separated man from God,—for thanksgiving, worship, and homage, for the free sacrifice of self, and for the closest union with God.

But the inadequacy of these sacrifices to purify the conscience would naturally bring again before the mind the necessity of an adequate substitute being found to bear the guilt of the sinner. Thus the old doctrine of a Divine sacrifice would rise up again, but founded now only on moral considerations, not on physical or cosmogonical myths. In this way the religion of satisfaction and penance gradually grows up, through the developments and suppressions introduced by Judaism, out of the primitive religion of creation and cosmogony. But when the development became known, the philosophical speculators who employed themselves in rehabilitating heathen mythology, by giving it a moral significance, found it so perfectly correspond with the prophetic anticipations of old heathenism that they treated it only as a development. Thus Celsus saw in Christianity only an application of the old doctrines of the mysteries,—“the heaven cut asunder that it might live, and the earth cut asunder with a sword, and many [men] cut asunder that they might live, and death put an end to in the world, when the sin of the world was put to death” (ap. *Orig. c. Cel. vi.*).



In these three instances the law of Moses is exhibited as a schoolmaster to prepare the primeval Gentilism for Christianity. In the first instance, we see the concrete, sensuous feeling of God gradually developed into an abstract form, into an idea which would have been as unintelligible to the first men as the abstract words of German or English are to a modern Papuan; while, on the other hand, the original sensuous idea of God is as difficult for us to go back to, as it is difficult for the European to catch the meaning of the simple inflexions of rudimentary languages. "Savages," says our greatest philologist, "children, and the men and women who lived when language was in its embryo, alone felt these inflexions; though feeling them, they could not think upon them." Judaism, and later Heathenism, brought the rudimentary notions of the primitive religious feeling into distinct consciousness; Judaism developed them in one way, Heathenism in another; and the event has decided upon their respective merits. The end of one was the philosophy of the Infinite Personal God, eternally distinct from the world, which He created and preserved. The end of the other was an abstract God, the universal soul of the world, a pantheistic essence, from which all things grow, and into which all fall back. In the second instance, we see Judaism gradually putting off the shell of the material, elemental cultus, which, in the absence of any abstract idea of God, was necessarily the religious ceremonial of the primeval religion, and thus preparing the way for Christianity, which suppressed the last vestiges of this "service of the beggarly elements." In the third instance, we see the Christian idea of sacrifice gradually developed through Judaism, from a means of expiating a destructive ceremonial defilement, and of maintaining the universe in its normal course, to the full moral significance of the Christian redemption.

From these instances, which might be greatly multiplied, we may discover that the first chapter of Genesis is the creed of the primitive patriarchal religion, not without reference to the heresies by which that religion was surrounded. This creed was inherited by Judaism, which, however, dropped most of the observances that might have been founded on it; for it had no *cultus* of the light for the first day of the week, of the heavens for the second, of the earth, sea, and plants for the third, of sun and moon for the fourth, of fishes or fowls for the fifth, of beasts or deified men for the sixth; but it only consecrated the seventh day, a day without cosmical significance, and therefore a proper symbol of the Sabbath or Rest of God. But still the creed remained as a protest

against the pagan superstitions which had been built on these worships, and declared those beings which the Pagans worshipped as gods to be only God's works. The Mosaic cosmogony holds this position of protest and explanation with regard to the heathen cosmogonies in a remarkable way. We have on both sides the original chaos, the successive development of the world through six or seven great powers or processes, the sacred tree, the serpent, paradise, the golden age of innocence, genealogies of patriarchs who lived a superhuman life, a deluge, and an ark. In the pagan systems all these things are personified, or confounded with God or with the powers of nature; elemental forces are attributed to human persons, and human characteristics are given to the forces of the elements, to the mountains, the trees, and the stars. All this is refuted to the intellect by the first chapters of Genesis, as it was refuted to the experience of the senses by the plagues of Egypt, when all these pretended gods, the oxen, the frogs, and the sacred river itself, were compelled by the might of the Creator to be the punishment of their worshippers.

This is the idea of the first chapters of Genesis. They constitute a religious document, not a treatise on astronomy, geology, or natural history. Beyond their first intention, they may have also a kind of prophetic reference to the natural science of these ages; but their meaning must always be determined by their original destination, which was to be the creed of a religion, and the rationale of a worship, not the guide of the astronomer, or the arsenal of ideas for the fabricators of theories to explain the way in which the worlds were made.

---



## MANUSCRIPTS AT CAMBRIDGE.

NOT the least interesting part of that vast and varied inheritance which has been bequeathed to all time by the genius and devotion of the Middle Ages, is its immensely rich store of manuscript literature. Till the general destruction or defacing of Catholic monuments, simply because they were Catholic, in the sixteenth and subsequent centuries, the accumulated Mss. of not less than a thousand years were stored up in monasteries and colleges, where the transcribers of many of them had themselves peacefully and usefully lived. It is on record, that after the suppression of the religious houses in this country, valuable Mss. by wagon-loads at a time were sold as waste-paper, to be burned in bakers' ovens, or to be used by the bookbinders.<sup>1</sup> To institute any inquiry as to the probable proportion of Mss. saved to Mss. accidentally lost or ruthlessly destroyed, would be an unavailing task. What we do know is, that an enormous number still exists; and that, in spite of wars, fires, thefts, revolutions, acts of fanaticism, edicts civil and ecclesiastical, and the barbarous neglect or ignorance of those who boasted of their superior appreciation of learning, any single library of note, either in England or on the Continent, yet contains a greater collection of medieval Mss. than the most indefatigable and devoted student of them could make himself acquainted with in a lifetime. In a word, the wonder is, that any considerable number have survived a series of events which seemed sufficient in themselves to have annihilated, by a gradual but long-continued exhaustion, every written remnant of the books of the Middle Ages.

The extensive public libraries at Oxford and Cambridge (not to mention the still larger collection in the British Museum) are very rich in Ms. literature. The Cambridge library, indeed, has not quite 4000 Mss.; but the Bodleian at Oxford contains some 30,000; and every college in both Universities has its private library. Nearly all these libraries—some forty in number—contain many Mss. of value, while not a few can boast of really magnificent, invaluable, and often unique volumes, by far the larger part of which are unpublished, and indeed remain all but unknown, even to the members of the colleges themselves. More than this, many of the Mss. in the college-libraries are not even yet fully or cor-

<sup>1</sup> The number of loose sheets, often of very considerable antiquity and interest, that have been recovered from the dilapidated bindings of old books, is great, and is still daily being augmented (see Maitland, *Dark Ages*, p. 280). Quite recently, the larger portion (about three-fourths) of a Ms. of Persius, of the thirteenth century, was found in the binding of an old book in the library of Clare Hall, Cambridge. It is in a tolerably perfect and quite legible condition, written on fine vellum, in a small and neat hand.

rectly catalogued; and it is only recently that printed catalogues of the Bodleian and the Cambridge public-library Mss. have been provided. At Cambridge, the libraries of Trinity, Corpus Christi, St. John's, Caius, and Emmanuel are rich in this respect; but especially the two first named, which have very extensive collections, and mostly of the highest value.

Regarded merely as works of high art and original inventive design, few objects can be more interesting than an elaborately illuminated Office-book. In an antiquarian point of view, such books are nearly the only reliable source from which we can obtain minute and accurate information on the dresses, furniture, usages, and manner of performing ceremonies civil and ecclesiastical, in the Middle Ages. The vestments, the decoration of altars, the tapestries, candles, church-plate; the rites of marriage and the other sacraments; the burial of the dead; with very many details relating to tournaments and martial life,—all these subjects and many more may be found depicted in illuminated Mss. And they have this especial value, that Mss. are not liable, like church-architecture, to those successive alterations which have too often disguised or obliterated the original features. Insertions, erasures, the addition of new pages, or even sheets, may occur; yet, nevertheless, what is really old remains, of course, the same. The freshness and brightness of illuminated books of five and even six centuries old is often truly surprising; and those not learned in the subject can sometimes hardly credit the date assigned to them by competent authorities.

The collection of Office-books, such as Psalteries, Latin Gospels, Graduals, Missals, &c., is very considerable in most of the great libraries; and at Cambridge there are many most interesting and ancient specimens, of some of which we shall attempt to give our readers some account,—premising, however, that, to be really and fully appreciated, a Ms. must be *seen*. Still, as very many who see Mss., and are quite competent to admire them as works of art, cannot *read* one word of them, we have judged that to decipher and print extracts from some few of them will be, on the whole, more serviceable than to describe, in the technical language of catalogues, the mere appearance or contents of a somewhat larger number.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that hitherto very little knowledge has existed on the subject of the old Catholic service-books. Even now, the general term applied to them, and not unfrequently to be seen as the sole title on the back, is “Missal.” Every office-book written in black-letter, with blue and red initials, and queer-looking Latin sentences, which it was neither very easy nor very convenient to read, was at one time a “Missal.” To discriminate Graduals, Antiphonals,



Manuals, Collectaries, Processionals, Breviaries, Pontificals, Hours, Primers, books of private devotions, and a dozen other titles of specific Church-offices, required a skill and tact possessed by very few. With the suppression of the ancient faith perished all concern about its peculiar literature. Probably there are but few now, among even the Catholics of this country, who have ever made any researches into the extensive department of medieval Church-offices, or who have a conception of their variety, or the changes they have undergone in name, matter, and arrangement according to local uses, and before the general introduction of the Roman uniformity.

The truth is, this alone constitutes a difficult and important branch of medieval learning, and of ritual and liturgical study. Mr. Maskell has hitherto worked nearly alone in it; and, like most men who revive or first call attention to a neglected science, he has left a vast deal undone. To Dr. Rock and Dr. Lingard very much is due; and it is only to be regretted that we do not possess more than even the important results we have derived from their lifelong studies.

Again, many of our present Mss. are composed of fragments taken from different books, written, it may be, at very different times, and collected and bound together without any other fitness than that of size. It is this which causes one of the principal difficulties in correctly cataloguing Mss. Thus, for example, the so-called "Durham Ritual" of the tenth century (recently edited by Mr. Stevenson for the Surtees Society) was, as Dr. Lingard has shown, no "Ritual" at all, but a miscellaneous collection of scraps and occasional pages from several distinct office-books.

Manuscript Missals, properly so called, are comparatively rare; indeed it is a matter of surprise, as well as regret, that so few complete copies appear earlier than the twelfth century. There is one, among several preserved at Cambridge, written before the reign of King John; and this is one of the oldest with which we are acquainted. A very considerable number of Primers, Manuals, and Hours, besides romances, poems, theological treatises, &c., are preserved, which supply interesting and important specimens of the English language from the time of Edward III., and even considerably before it.

The first Ms. we select for notice is the *Book of Cerne*, or Gospels of Ethelwald the Bishop. This is a quarto, written on thick vellum, now in the University Library at Cambridge.<sup>4</sup> It seems to have belonged to Ethelwald, who was Bishop of Sherborne in 760, and was probably written for him, and it was formerly in the possession of Cerne Abbey in Dorsetshire. Though the rather various contents of this precious and

<sup>4</sup> Marked Ll. i. 10.

unique volume are in Latin, the Anglo-Saxon characters are used throughout. The name of "Ethelwald the Bishop" is written in an acrostic on fol. 21. We shall give this, and several other important and interesting extracts (which have not hitherto been published), in the present article. Of the genuineness and great antiquity of this Ms. not the slightest doubt can be entertained. All judges of Mss. to whom it has been shown concur in the opinion, that it cannot be placed much later than the lifetime of Venerable Bede. This opinion, formed from the character of the writing alone, is confirmed, not to say fully established, by the known date of Ethelwald.

The volume commences with the "Passion and Resurrection," from the four Latin Gospels. Each Gospel has a portrait of the Evangelist prefixed. It is enclosed in a circle placed over and upon the apex of a semicircular arch, which is supported on pillars with very rude capitals and bases, closely resembling in detail the architecture of still remaining Saxon churches. St. Matthew is represented as holding a book: he is dressed in loose flowing robes, which it is difficult to identify with any particular ecclesiastical vestments; the hair, surrounded by a nimbus, is thick and clustering; and the face is strongly, and by no means badly, drawn. The inscription, in capital letters of very early form, on both sides of the portrait, is "✠ hic Matheus in humanitate." In the arch, and directly below, is his symbol, the winged angel, who is holding a closed book, with a nimbus round the clustering hair, and with the title, "✠ hic Matheus in angelica aspectu (*sic*) videtur." The colours used are only dark red and blue. The text has an elaborately illuminated heading of interlacing capital letters, and commences with St. Matthew, ch. xxvi., "Et factum est cum consummasset IHS sermones hos omnes," &c. The words *Et factum est* form the illuminated heading, and are preceded by the title, "Passio dni ni ihu xpi secundum Matheum." On fol. 12 there is a similar portrait of St. Mark, also holding a book, with "✠ hic Marcus in humanitate." Below is a winged lion clasping a book with sharp protruded claws, and with the inscription, "hic Marcus imaginem tenet leonis." The text is (beginning Mark xiv.), "Erat autem pascha" (these words illuminated as before) "et azyma post biduum, et quærebant summi sacerdotes," &c., to the end.

Fol. 21 contains the acrostic of "Aedelwald Episcopus," which is written in different-coloured inks on the back of the portrait of St. Luke. The hand-writing, though similar to the rest in its general character, seems to be not identical; whence it might be very fairly inferred that the book itself is even still more ancient. We cannot, however, assume that the back of this portrait was originally blank, because there is



original writing on the backs of the other portraits following; and the name of Ethelwald occurs elsewhere in the volume, as the collector of some of the devotional pieces.

St. Luke is represented as holding an open book and a reed pen, which he appears to be dipping into a very small inkhorn suspended near him. The inscription is "✠ hic Lucas in humanitate." Within the arch below is a winged bull, holding a book between his fore-legs, with "hic Lucas formam accepit vituli." The Gospel commences with ch. xxii., "Adpropinquavat autem dies festus azemorum qui dicitur pascha," &c. The two first words are illuminated, and *b* is written as a correction over the *v* in *Adpropinquavat*. This Gospel, as is the case with the rest, is continued to the end.

On fol. 31 is a similar portrait of St. John holding a closed volume, and inscribed, "✠ hic Johannis in humanitate." Below it is the eagle, who holds a book with human arms but aquiline talons. Like the rest, the figures have the nimbus, and the ground is stencilled over with minute dots in red ink, arranged in small inverted pyramids. But in this case only the capitals of the pillars supporting the arch have grotesque heads. The eagle is inscribed, "hic Johannis vertit frontem in aquilam." The execution of these interesting specimens of very early art is on the whole decidedly good, though quaint, and they remain in good preservation. A little gold is used in the more elaborate initial letters; but the colours employed are chiefly yellow, blue, and a dull red. The headings throughout are in red ink, and sometimes the small capitals commencing a new verse or sentence are slightly touched with colour.

The text of St. John's Gospel begins with chap. xviii., "Hæc cum dixisset IHS" (these words illuminated) "egressus est cum discipulis suis," &c. It ends on fol. 40, with the following beautiful prayer, written in a different hand, but in Anglo-Saxon letters, and apparently not much later:

"Domine sce pater omnipotens, æterne deus, qui fecisti cælum et terram, mare et omnia quæ in iis sunt, sit tibi semper honor et gloria, virtus et imperium, fortitudo et potestas, et gratiarum actio in perpetuum, quod mihi indigno famulo tuo præstitisti ut hæc sacra mysteria pullutis labiis et impuro corde atque incasto corpore et inquinato vestimento tuo tamen glorioso nomini ad laudem et ad honorem dicere potui; præsta mihi quæso per tuam magnam misericordiam et pietatem, ut hæc sacra verba tuæ gloriosæ passionis animæ meæ venient ad salutem et in remissionem [*sic*] omnium peccatorum meorum, et in benedictionem omnium dierum ac noctium vitæ meæ, quam in sempiterna requie tam etiam in præsentī sospitate. Amen."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> It may be well to mention, that in this and the other extracts the punctuation is not always precisely that of the Ms., but that required by the sense.

This is followed by another prayer, entitled "Alma Oratio," and is similar to one comprised in Alcuin's works.

On fol. 42, the following metrical version of "Laudate pueri" (Ps. cxii.) occurs:

"Laudate altithronum, pueri, laudate tonantem;  
 Sit magnum domini benedictum in sæcula nomen,  
 Solis ab exortu dominum laudate potentem,  
 Solis ad occasum in ymnis persistite laudum.  
 Excelsus gentes dominus supereminet omnes,  
 Ejus et astriferos transcendit gloria cælos.  
 Quis domini est similis sedes cui perpes in altis,  
 Inque domo sterilem habitare benignus, et amplo  
 Lætare (*sic*) tribuit natorum germine matrem."

Then follows, on the same page, the Lord's Prayer done into hexameter verses:

"Sidereo genitor residens in vertice cæli,  
 Nominis, oramus, veneratio sanctificetur  
 In nobis, Pater alte, tui, tranquillaque mundo  
 Adveniat, regnumque tuum lux alma recludat  
 In cælo: in terra tua fiat clara voluntas,  
 Vitalisque hodie sancti substantia panis  
 Proveniat nobis: tua mox largitio<sup>6</sup> solvat  
 Innumera indulgens erroris debita pravi,  
 Et nos haut aliter concedere fenore<sup>7</sup> nostris.  
 Tetri sæva procul temptatio dæmonis absit,  
 Eque<sup>8</sup> malis tua nos in lucem dextera tollat."

This is followed by three short prayers, ending with "bnfo," i.e. *amen*; the letters next following the proper ones severally composing *amen* being taken.

On fol. 43 we have a very curious metrical hymn, or charm, interlined with a valuable Saxon glossary, and called *lurica*, probably because it was worn as a phylactery or amulet, to protect the person, like a cuirass (*lorica*). It is the same, as nearly as possible word for word, as that recently printed in Mone's *Hymni Latini Medii Ævi*, vol. i. p. 367. It contains many words of the most extraordinary kind, neither the dialect nor the meaning of which appears to be known. The heading is this: "hanc luricam Loding cantavit ter in omne die" (in red ink), with an illuminated line below it. The opening prayer of the *lorica* runs thus:

"Suffragare Trinitatis unitas,<sup>9</sup> unitatis miserere Trinitas, suffragare quæso mihi posito maris velut in periculo, Ut non secum trahat me mortalitas hujus anni,<sup>10</sup> neque mundi vanitas, Et hoc idem peto a sublimibus cælestis militiæ virtutibus, Ne me linquant lacerandum hostibus, sed defendant iam armis fortibus, Et illi me precedant in

<sup>6</sup> Ms. *largito*, corrected.

<sup>7</sup> Qu. *fenora*?

<sup>8</sup> Ms. *aeque*.

<sup>9</sup> The final *s* in *Trinitatis* forms a border ornament.

<sup>10</sup> This seems to refer to some plague.



acie cælestis exercitus militiæ, Cheruphin et Seraphin cum milibus.  
Et mihahel gabriel similibus."

The *Te Deum* next follows (fol. 44), with a series of morning hymns, prayers, and mixed confessions; then (fol. 50) the beginning words of "Benedicite" and "Gloria in excelsis" (both with verse and response), "Credite (*sic*) propter," with Pater noster; then "Miserere mei domine" (Ps. li.), and Pater noster, followed by a confession, and closing with the opening words of Matins. (An office of very similar kind is included in Alcuin's works.)

From fol. 52 to 83 is a collection of prayers, consisting of fifty-five in all, mostly short, some rhythmical, and for the greater part, we believe, hitherto quite unknown. The headings of some of these are as follows: "Oratio Sancti Gregori Papæ" (fol. 52); "Oratio ad dominum ab Alchfrido anch. (anchorita) compositum" (*sic*) (fol. 72); "Oratio ad archang. Michaeli" (*sic*) (fol. 76); "Oratio ad sanctam Mariam" (fol. 77); "Oratio ad sanctum Andrean" (fol. 81); "Commoniter ad Apostolos" (fol. 81). The two last we append below.

No. 17 is headed "incipit rithmon;" and No. 18, "incipit brithmon." The former is the hymn beginning "Sancte sator suffragator," which is known from other sources. The terms 'rithmon' and 'brithmon' (or 'hrithmon') seem corruptions of 'rhythmus.' Nos. 33 and 44 (also 34) are hymns by Alchfrith the Anchorite. No. 32 is entitled "Incipit oratio ad dominum sancti effremis" (Ephraëmis?); No. 48, "Oratio sancti a petri apost." (fol. 79); No. 49, "Oratio ad sanctum petrum" (ibid.); No. 55, "Oratio de apostolis sanctis domini nostri ihu xpi" (fol. 82); No. 3, "Oratio utilis de membra (*sic*) xpi" (fol. 54); Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 20, 21, 38, "Oratio ad dominum" (or *sancta* ad &c.); No. 25, "Oratio de natale domini nostri ihu xpi" (fol. 69); No. 35, "Oratio pænitentis" (fol. 73).

The following is on fol. 81:

"Oratio ad scm andream.



O andreas sce.  
pro mé intercede  
ut euadam puræ  
flammas duræ poenæ.  
Té nunc peto care  
mane atque nocte  
né dormiam strictæ  
animæ in morte.

O andreas sce.  
pro me intercede.  
Neque inimicus  
præualeat nimis,  
quia sum inanis  
terra atque cinis.  
O andreas sce.  
Ne me derelinquas.

cum impiis perire;  
 Sce me dignare  
 sanare in fine.  
 O andreas sce.  
 Esto nunc adiutor  
 atque gubernator,  
 ut sit mihi tutor  
 rex cæli creator.  
 O andreas sce.  
 In té nunc confido,  
 xp̄i miles magnus,  
 quia sum infirmus,  
 pauper atque paruus.  
 O andreas sce.  
 O petre germane,  
 uere mira prolis,  
 lampas larga legis,  
 splendor summi solis.  
 O andreas sce.  
 Comes xp̄i carus  
 retribue relictis,  
 tu magnus<sup>11</sup> in factis,  
 tu magnus in dictis.  
 O andreas sce.

Tu verus piscator  
 generis humani,  
 sagina cum leni  
 euangelii clari.<sup>12</sup>  
 O andreas sce.  
 Tu uirilis uictor,  
 tu fortis bellator,  
 tu meus adiutor,  
 tu meus sanator.  
 O andreas sce.  
 Sedebis in fine,  
 sublimi in sede,  
 fulgebis praeclare  
 cum regnorum rege.  
 O andreas sce.  
 Eris ciues clarus  
 ciuitatis miræ,  
 regnabis cum rege  
 regum sine fine.  
 O andreas sce.  
 pro mé intercede  
 ut euadam puræ  
 flammas duræ pœnæ."

The correct way of reading this beautiful hymn is as follows :

O Andreas sancte,  
 Pro me intercede,  
 Ut euadam purè  
 Flammas duræ pœnæ.  
 Te nunc peto, cave  
 Mane atque nocte,  
 Ne dormiam strictè  
 Animæ in morte.  
 O Andreas sancte,  
 Pro me intercede, &c.

So that "O Andreas," and the three next lines, are to be repeated after every four verses throughout.

The following is curious and interesting, though it is evidently corrupt, and in parts quite unintelligible :

"Oratio sce (54, part iii.).

*Commoniter*<sup>13</sup> *ad Apostolos.*

Teto (*sic*) petri pastoris praesidia,  
 Et iacobi iusti adiutoria  
 Andreæ quoque optimi egregia.

<sup>11</sup> Ms. has *magnus* twice.

<sup>12</sup> *Clari* seems an error for *sator*.

<sup>13</sup> i.e. *communiter*, addressed to the Apostles severally by name.



Et iohannis almis<sup>14</sup> dei gratia.  
 Alti clari jacobi eminamina (5)  
 Multi mundi mathei merita.  
 Tonantem thomæ tota pertutamina.  
 Mé defendunt philippi vocamina.  
 Boni beati bartholomei benigna.  
 Judæ misi leni læta lucida. (10)  
 Summi zelotis perpetuæ simonis.  
 Pauli puri piissimi oracula.  
 Omnes istos ut euadam agmina  
 Dira dura dæmonium pessima.  
 Et clara caeli celsi culmina. (15)  
 Cinis cautus castus diligentia  
 Dominum deum dare mihi mansura.  
 Uerum uinum uitam uiam futuram.  
 Uerbum caro factum misera  
 Mihi malo miserere. Gloria (20)  
 Regi regum rectori per omnia  
 Sine fine sæculorum in sæcula.  
 Amen."

It is very difficult to conjecture what was the original reading of some of the above verses. A suggestion is here offered of what may have been the commencement :

Peto Petri pastoris præsidia,  
 Et Jacobi justi adjutoria ;  
 Andreae quoque optimi egregia  
 Marci, Lucae, Matthei merita,  
 Et Iohannis almi Dei gratia ;  
 Alta clari Jacobi eminamina,  
 Tonantis Thomæ tuta pertutamina,  
 Me defendant Philippi vocamina.

For *et clara*, in v. 15, we may restore *ad clara*. Of v. 10 and v. 16 nothing certain can be made. But it is easy to arrange what follows, thus :

Dominum Deum dare mihi mansuram  
 Veræ vivæ vitæ viam futuram.  
 Verbum caro factum, misero mihi  
 Malo miserere, &c.

The following is entitled " Oratio sancta ad dominum cœli," and is No. 2 of part iii. :

Deus Pater Omnipotens domine cœli ac terræ,  
 Deduc me obsecro te per misericordiam pietatis tuæ,  
 Ubi resplendent semper angelorum milia,  
 Regem regum laudantes cum ingenti gloria.  
 Ubi viginti quatuor seniores sunt proni,  
 Agnum Dei laudantes ante conspectum throni.  
 Ubi mystica quatuor animalia  
 Tota oculis plena tam mira magnalia.  
 Ubi illa flumina bis bina manantia  
 Uno e fontis rore inrigati.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Corrected to *almi*.

<sup>15</sup> Read *irrigantia*.

Ubi Patriarchæ primi credentes Deo  
 Cives urbis diurnæ regnantes sine fine cum eo.  
 Ubi Prophetæ puri Spiritu Sancto pleni  
 Christum collaudant clara causa luminis veri.  
 Ubi sancta Maria sanctis cum virginibus  
 Vitæ fruantes premis [præmiis] in thronis sublimibus.  
 Ubi Petrus et Paulus Christi cum apostolis  
 Regnant cum rege sedentes<sup>16</sup> in cathhethris (*sic*).  
 Ubi sequuntur Agnum turbæ Innocentium,  
 Virginitatis flore amœno florentium.  
 Ubi Martyrum chori amicti stolis albis  
 Christo canentes habentes vitæ palmam.<sup>17</sup>  
 Ubi Virgines Sanctæ Castitatis nimiam  
 Habent Palmam gloriæ regni regię.<sup>18</sup>  
 Ubi sanctorum turbæ domino canentium  
 Gaudent cum pace firma in terra viventium,  
     Ubi est felicitas,  
     Ubi est securitas,  
     Ubi semper sanitas,  
     Ubi mentis puritas,  
     Ubi nullus dolor,  
     Ubi nec mentis<sup>19</sup>  
 Nec iræ furor  
 Nec dolor laborantibus.  
     Ubi nullus esurit,  
     Ubi nec ullus bibit,  
     Ubi ignis non urit,  
     Ubi nullus peribit.  
     Ubi senex non manet,  
     Ubi juvenis florebit,  
     Ubi læsus non gemit,  
     Ubi pauper non plorat.  
     Ubi pax perpetua,  
     Ubi et lætitia,  
     Ubi nec molestia,"

and so on for a considerable number of verses. In the fifth and following lines of the short hymn there seems to be some corruption. Probably it should be read thus:

    Ubi nullus dolor,  
     Ubi non est mentibus  
 Nec dolor nec furor  
 Ira laborantibus.

The next extract we print is entitled "Oratio in cena Domini" (fol. 70):

"Deus perfugium pauperum, spes humilium salusque miserorum, qui remotis obumbrationibus carnalium victimarum spiritalem nobis hostiam et viventem placentem patrique inchoantem dedicasti, quando

<sup>16</sup> Some epithet like *altis* has dropped out; or perhaps "Regnant cum suo rege," &c.

<sup>17</sup> Apparently we should read

Christo canentes habent æternæ vitæ palmam.

<sup>18</sup> Probably we should read *regiam*.

<sup>19</sup> Perhaps *mentibus*.



cenantibus discipulis panem et calicem benedicendo atque porrigendo dixisti, Accipite et manducate, hoc est corpus meum; et iterum, Hic est calix sanguinis mei novi testamenti, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum; gratias tibi reffero et per hoc clementiam tuam suppliciter depono, ut illo sanctissimo ac salutifero pretio purificata atque sanctificata redimi merear hic et in futuro, Domine mi Jesu Christe. Amen."

The following prayer to the Blessed Virgin is of the highest interest, if only for its intense devotion. It occurs on fol. 77 :

" Sancta Dei genetrix, semper Virgo beata, benedicta, gloriosa, et generosa, intacta et intemerata, casta et incontaminata Maria immaculata, electa et a Deo dilecta, singulari sanctitate prædita, atque omni laude digna, quæ es interpellatrix pro totius mundi discrimine; exaudi, exaudi, exaudi nos, sancta Maria. Ora pro nobis et intercede et auxiliare ne dedigneris. Confidimus enim et pro certo scimus quia omne quod vis potes impetrare a Filio tuo Domino nostro Jesu Christo, Deo omnipotenti, omnium sæculorum rege, qui vivit cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto in sæcula sæculorum. Amen."

Part iv. (fol. 84 to 99) contains several hymns, hitherto, we believe, unpublished, except the first, which begins "ymnum dicat turba fratrum, ymnum cantus personet." No. 6 is a *versicularius* or *versorius*, headed (but in red letters very nearly illegible), "hoc argumentum forsorii (i. e. *versarii*) ædelwald episcopus decerpsit." No. 7 (fol. 98) is a *descensus ad inferos*. It contains a dialogue of our Lord in limbo with Adam and Eve. We give this entire, as it does not appear in the printed *Evangelium Nicodemi*.

"Hoc est oratio innumerabilis sanctorum populi qui tenebantur in inferno captivitate [et] lacrimabili voce et obsecratione Salvatorem deprecantur dicentes, quando ad inferos descendit.

Advenisti, Redemptor mundi, advenisti, quem desiderantes cotidie sperabamus, advenisti, quem nobis futurum lux [*lex*] nuntiaverat et prophetæ, advenisti, donans in carne vivis indulgentiam peccatoribus mundi. Solve defunctos captivos Inferni; descendisti pro nobis ad Inferos; noli nobis deesse, cum fueris reversurus ad superos. Posuisti titulum gloriæ in sæcula; pone signum victoriæ in Inferno;<sup>20</sup> fiat nunc, Domine, misericordia tua super nos, sicut speravimus in te. Quoniam apud te est fons vitæ, et in lumine tuo videbimus lumen. Ostende nobis, Domine, misericordiam tuam, et salutare tuum da nobis. Memento congregationis tuæ, quam creasti ab initio; ne memineris iniquitates nostras antiquas; cito nos anticipiet (*sic*) misericordia tua, quia pauperes facti sumus nimis. Adjuva nos,

<sup>20</sup> This alludes to the established custom of painting our Lord, before His resurrection, holding a cross and standard to the souls in purgatory. This subject is magnificently treated in one of the stained windows of King's College Chapel.

Deus salutaris noster, et propter honorem nominis tui, Domine, libera nos et propitius esto peccatis nostris propter nomen tuum.

*Post quam autem audita est postulatio et obsecratio innumera-  
bilitum captiuorum*, Statim iubente Domino omnes antiqui iusti sine aliqua mora ad imperium Domini salvatoris resolutis uinculis, Domini saluatoris genibus obvoluti humili supplicatione cum ineffabili gaudio clamantes: Disrupisti, Domine, uincula nostra; tibi sacrificamus hostiam laudis. Quia non secundum peccata nostra fecisti nobis, neque secundum iniquitates nostras retribuisti nobis.

*Adam autem et Eva adhuc non sunt desoluti de uinculis*. Tunc Adam lugubri ac miserabili uoce clamabat ad Dominum, dicens: Miserere mei, Deus, miserere mei in magna misericordia tua; et in multitudine miserationum tuarum dele iniquitatem meam; quia tibi soli peccavi et malum coram te feci; erravi sicut ovis quæ perierat; resolve uincula mea, quia manus tuæ fecerunt me et plasmauerunt me; ne derelinquas in Inferno animam meam, sed fac mecum misericordiam, et educ uinctum de domo carceris et umbræ mortis.

*Tunc Domino miserante Adam e uinculis resolutus, domini Christi genibus provolutus*, Benedic anima mea Dominum, et omnia interiora mea nomen sanctum ejus. Qui propitius factus est iniquitatibus meis, qui sanavit omnes languores meos. Qui redimet de interitu uitam meam, qui satiat in bonis desiderium meum.

*Adhuc Eva persistit in fletu*.

Justus es, Domine, et rectum iudicium tuum, quia merito hæc patior; nam ego cum in honore essem non intellexi: comparatus sum jumentis insipientibus, et nunc similis factus sum illis; sed tu, Domine, delicta juventutis et insipientiæ meæ ne memineris. Ne auertas faciem misericordiæ tuæ a me, et ne declines in ira ab ancilla tua."<sup>21</sup>

On fol. 2 there is the latter part of an exhortation in Anglo-Saxon. It is written on the reverse of the portrait of St. Matthew, and is very difficult to decipher; but as it is of some interest, if only from the fact that it is believed to be about the earliest specimen of Anglo-Saxon writing existing, we give it here, with a translation:

ƿðe geopne gebide gece 7miltre ƿope alpa hƿ  
halgpa gepƿphtum 7ge eapningum 7boenum bo  
. . . ƿ. num ðaðe dno dð gehceðon ƿrom ƿpuman  
miððan gearðer, ðonne 7e hepeð he ðec ðoph hƿopa  
ðingunge. Do ðonne ƿopðan ƿiðe ðin hleop ðpiga  
to ƿopðan, ƿope alle goðer cƿican 77ung ðar  
ƿeƿr, Dni e7c salus, Saluum fac populum  
tuum dne, Ppaetende misericordiam tuam,  
Sing ðonne Patep no7teƿ, gebide ðonne ƿope  
alle geleap77ullæ menn inmundo, ðonne bi7tu ðone  
ðeg ðael nomende ðoph ðp7htney 7ere alpa ðeapa  
goða ðe ænig monn ƿop hƿ noman 7eðoeð, 7ðec alle  
ƿoð7e7tæ ƿope ðinguað, in caelo et in terra. Amen.

<sup>21</sup> The above is a faithful transcript from the original, except that the punctuation is corrected, and here and there very slightly the orthography. The lines in italics are written in red ink.



"And then earnestly pray grace and mercy for the works and the merits and . . . . of all his saints, that the Lord God have pleased from the beginning of the world. Then heareth He thee through their intercessions; bow then a fourth time thy face thrice to the earth for all God's Church, and sing this verse, *Domini est salus, Saluum fac populum tuum Domine, Præte de misericordiam tuam*. Sing then *Pater noster*; pray then for all the faithful men *in mundo*: then art thou the same day a partaker through the Lord's gift of all those good things that any man doeth for his name, and for thee all true [folk] intercede in heaven and on earth. Amen."

Not by any means the least of the literary curiosities in this volume is its acrostic dedication to Bishop Ethelwald. This occurs in fol. 21, and is as follows:<sup>22</sup>

A	eterna deo donante munera seruunculo zad	i
E	iusque laboribus diuinis merces in xpo paratu	s
D	onam dignam dabit in caelis sedemque sanctam semper beaui	t
E	i beata præmia ubi sancti plaudent coram xpo inaethri	s
L	audet atque deum eminentem super sidera cæli cum sancti	s
V	bi uiuent sine fine clariter cum beatis et iusti	s
A	bangelis conlaudatus pater cum filio filius cum spiritu sancto	o
L	aetus sit coram iudici uero ubi epulant cum conaco	b
D	eo inuisibili sit gloria ethonor cui numen inalti	s
E	n omnipotenti deo libellum hanc ad laudem scribere feci	t
P	atrem æternum postulandam uiam uitæ æternæ saluti	s
I	ndomum gredi dñi cum fiducia huic uolumini oracul' text	i
S	olum deum castis carminibus indesinenter diligenter pulsat	e
C	opiosa præmia carpentes cælorum culmino cum agminibus sci	s
O	mnis homo operis mercedem metet tamen mea piacula del	e
P	ater immensæ maiestatis misericorditer relaxa culpi	s
V	t cum dño possit mirifice ovari cum ceruphin atque seraphi	n
S	ine fine modulare sallere scs scs scs dns deus zabaot	h

The reader will at once perceive that, as it stands in the Ms., it is by no means in all parts very intelligible. But whether the errors are those of the transcriber or the composer, it is vain to conjecture. Probably it was intended to run nearly thus:

"Æterna Deo donante munera servunculo Zadi,<sup>23</sup> ejusque laboribus diuinis merces in Christo paratas, donum dignum dabit in cælis sanctam sedem, semperque beabit ei beata præmia, ubi Sancti plaudunt coram Christo in æthris, laudabitque deum eminentem super sidera cæli cum sanctis, ubi uiuent sine fine clariter cum beatis et

<sup>22</sup> Lines 1, 9, 15, 18, are in brown; 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, 16, in purple; 3, 6, 11, 14, in green; 5, 7, 13, 17, in red.

<sup>23</sup> This seems the name of the transcriber of the book; and if so, it resembles the later Byzantine-Greek name *Tzetza* or *Tzetzes*.

iustis, ab angelis collaudatus Pater cum Filio, Filius cum Spiritu Sancto. Lætus sit coram iudice vero, ubi epulant cum *conacob*.<sup>24</sup> Deo invisibili sit gloria et honor, cui nomen in altis! Ei omnipotenti Deo libellum hunc ad laudem scribere fecit,<sup>25</sup> Patrem æternum postulans dare viam vitæ æternæ salutis, Ingredi domum Domini cum fiducia huic volumini, oraculo texti. Solum Deum castis carminibus indesinenter diligenter pulsate, copiosa præmia carpentes cælorum culmine cum agminibus sanctis. Omnis homo operis mercedem metet; tamen mea piacula dele, Pater immensæ majestatis; misericorditer relaxa culpis, ut cum Domino possit mirifice ovare, [et] cum cherubim atque seraphim sine fine modulatè psallere, Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth."

The next Ms. we shall notice is one of scarcely less interest than the Book of Cerne, nor probably much later in date. Like it, it is in Latin, written in the Anglo-Saxon or Gaelic character, probably by an Irish hand. This is a copy of the Gospels on vellum, a very small quarto, hardly exceeding in size a modern 12mo, formerly belonging to the church and convent of Deer, a town in Aberdeenshire. It was probably written not much later than 800. At the end of the volume, after the Apostles' Creed, is a short prayer in Gaelic, of which this is a translation: "Be it on the conscience of every man to whom shall be advantage from this book, to pray for a blessing upon the soul of the wretch who wrote it."

The text of the Gospels, with the exception of St. John, is not complete. It is beautifully written; and, to those who are at all used to the Saxon character, not difficult to decipher. The first part of St. Matthew forms a detached prologue, "*Liber generationis Jhu Xpi filii david filii abraham*," &c., to "*usque ad Xpm generationes xiiii*."<sup>26</sup> *Finit prologus.* Item incipit nunc Evangelium secundum Matheum." This commences with a beautifully drawn initial letter. Then follow some pieces of Gaelic writing, both in different hands from the rest, and occupying nearly three pages.

St. Matthew's Gospel only contains chap. i. 18 to chap. vii. 23; St. Mark's, chap. i. 1 to chap. v. 35; St. Luke's, chap. i. 1 to chap. iv. 2; but St. John's Gospel is complete.

On fol. 39 there is a Latin record of about a dozen lines by a different hand, but in Gaelic letters, being the confirmation of an immunity granted to the church of Deer by David king of the Scots (A.D. 1120 to 1156), from all lay duties and exactions. It is signed by several bishops and landowners of the neighbourhood. This passage has been already printed

<sup>24</sup> Possibly "*cum Jacobo*," or "*cum Agno*;" but conjecture seems of little avail. There is a sort of metre, hexameter or heptameter, constructed according to accent, not quantity.

<sup>25</sup> i.e. *Zades*, or whoever was the writer.

<sup>26</sup> Matt. i. 17.



in the *Saturday Review* for December 8, 1860 (vol. x. p. 734), where a translation also is given of the Gaelic text. It is sufficiently curious, however, to deserve reprinting in this place:

“David Rex Scottorum omnibus probis hominibus suis salutes. Sciatis quod clerici de Dér sunt quieti et immunes ab omni laicorum officio et exactione indebita, sicut in libro eorum scribturn est et dirationaverunt apud Banb (*Banff*) et juraverunt apud Abberdeon (*Aberdeen*), quapropter firmiter precipio ut nullus eis aut eorum catellis aliquam injuriam inferre presumat. Teste Gregorio Episcopo de Duncallden (*Dunkeld*). Teste Andrea Episcopo de Catenia (*Caitness*). Teste Samsone Episcopo de Brechin. Teste Doncado (*Duncan*) comite de Fíb (*Fife*), et Ggillebrite comite d Engus (*Angus*), et Ggillecomded Mac Aed (*Magee*), et Cormac de Turbrud, et Adam Mac Ferdomnac, et Gillendrias Mac Mátni apud Abberdeon.”

The most curious part of the volume, perhaps, is its rude illuminations, or rather rough and quaint pen-and-ink sketches, which are only slightly coloured with pale yellow and brownish-red paint. The frontispiece is divided into four compartments by a cross, with an ornamental circle in the centre. In each of the two upper divisions is a squat figure, dressed in a kind of square tunic or frock, with something like a crossed stole in front. The feet, or rather the toes, appear below; but the arms and legs are not drawn at all. The two figures underneath seem to be attired in a chasuble, the ends of which are folded over the knees in a circular form. Over the breast is a rather large square apparel, or *rationale*, suspended from the neck by three strings. The whole is so utterly rude, and indeed barbaric, as to defy a detailed description. The figures, as well as the interlacing marginal ornaments, can only be compared to the rude forms carved on Saxon or Runic stone crosses. They are characteristic of early Irish Mss., as are the dotted and interlaced capital letters. The figures may represent the four Evangelists.

Each of the Evangelists, according to the almost invariable custom of very early Mss., is represented in a portrait prefixed to his Gospel, and enclosed in an elaborate border of interlacing knots or minute lines. St. Matthew holds the hilt of a sword pointing downwards between his feet,—a rare symbol, but given in Mr. Husenbeth's list of “Emblems of the Saints.” He is dressed in a loose and not very shapely mantle, apparently intended for a chasuble, and he seems to be holding a book on his side. Two smaller figures are added on the sides of the head; but they are rude scratches, with no distinctive character. St. Mark is equally rude as a drawing. He wears

the chasuble with the round ends, and a large rationale, as before described. No symbol is attached to this figure. St. Luke has his arms extended, so as to pass on each side through the border; but they are very badly drawn, curving upwards immediately above the shoulders. Here also there is no symbol. St. John has the apparel on the breast, but is represented without arms and without symbol. Six small figures are drawn on the sides. The colours of all these are pale yellow and brown.

At the end of St. John's Gospel (fol. 83) are two small figures of similar device. These are in brighter yellow, and a brown of metallic lustre (vermilion oxydised). At the end of the volume there are two more illuminated pages, closely resembling the frontispiece, and each containing four figures. These have very long arms expanded from under the chin, and are greatly out of all anatomical proportions.

Assuming that the dress of all these figures is meant to represent the chasuble, considerable interest must attach to a representation, however rude, of the vestments worn by a Gaelic priest in the ninth century. If, as is probable, the chasuble was derived from the toga,—which is indicated by the originally circular form of both,—the appearance of the rounded ends over the knees would be accounted for. The collar, or rather the neck-folds, seem to be most ample, and quite unlike any fashion that we are acquainted with in the Middle Ages. The square apparel on the breast is the most characteristic and well-marked feature of these portraits. It is described by Dr. Rock in his *Hierurgia*, and is evidently the origin, combined with the broad stripe or orphrey down the middle of the peaked chasuble, of the large cross now worn on the back, but formerly on the front, of the officiating priest. In some early incised slabs, especially those existing in the churches at Rome, this combination is very clearly seen. The broad stripe itself was the *laticlave* of the Romans; this was a purple border extending down the breast of the *tunica*, and worn as a badge of distinction by senators and certain priests. In allusion to its position, Juvenal says, “*latum demisit pectore clavum.*” From the symbolical and cross-like form produced by the combination of orphrey and rationale, it was found convenient and appropriate to exhibit it on the side more conspicuous to the people, *i. e.* the back of the celebrant priest. This latter device is, however, comparatively modern, and there seems to be no precedent for it in any representations of ancient art.

At the end of the Gospel of St. Mark, on the reverse of a blank page, fol. 27, and occupying it and half of the opposite



page, is a fragment of what appears to be a Mass. It is written in Saxon character, but by a different hand, probably not later than the tenth century.

"Item oratio an̄ (ante) dominicam orationem.

Creator naturarum omnium deus, et parens universarum in cœlo<sup>27</sup> et in terra originum, has trementis populi<sup>28</sup> tui relegiosas preces ex illo inaccessibileis lucis trono tuo suscipe, et inter hiruphin et zaraphin indefessas circumstantium laudes exaudi spei non ambigue preces. Pater noster qui es . . . usque in finem.<sup>29</sup>

Libera nos domine a malo, amen. Christe Jesu, custodi nos semper in omni opere bona, fons et auctor omnium bonorum deus, evacua nos vitiis, et reple nos virtutibus bonis, per te Christe Jesu.

(Here follows a rubric in Gaelic, "Here give the sacrifice to him.")

Corpus cum sanguine dni nostri Jesu Christi sanitas sit tibi in vitam perpetuam et salutem.

Refecti Christi corpore et sanguine tibi semper dicamus domine alleluia, alleluia.<sup>30</sup> Quia satiavit animam inanem et animam esurientem satiavit bonis. Alleluia, alleluia.<sup>30</sup>

Et sacrificent sacrificium laudis et . . . usque exultatione. Alleluia, alleluia.

Calicem salutaris accipiam et nomen Domini invocabo. Alleluia, &c.

Refecti Christi corpore, alleluia, alleluia.

Laudate Dominum omnes gentes, alleluia, alleluia.

Gloria. Refecti Christi, alleluia, &c.

Et nunc et semper. Refecti . . .

Sacrificate sacrificium justitiæ et sperate in domino.

Deus tibi gratias agimus, per quem misteria sancta celebravimus et a te sanctitatis dona deposcimus, miserere nobis domine salvator mundi, qui regnas in secula seculorum. Amen. Finit."

This fragment resembles the Gallican family of Masses, as published by Mabillon in 1685.

The Gospel of St. John ends on the reverse of fol. 83, with "Explicit Evangelium secundum Johannem." At the bottom of the same page is a vignette of two figures, painted yellow and brown, in square borders or pannels. These resemble the rest in the book, all being nearly of one character. On the next page (fol. 84), the Apostles' Creed is written by the original hand, and it runs thus:

"Credo in d̄m patrem omnipotentem, creatorem celi et terre. Et in īm xpm filium ejus unicum dnm nrm qui conceptus est de sp̄tū sco. Natus ex maria virgine. passus sub pontio pylato. crucifixus et sepultus. descendit ad inferna. Tertia die resurrexit a mor-

<sup>27</sup> Ms. inelo.

<sup>28</sup> Ms. pli.

<sup>29</sup> Say "Pater noster" to the end.

<sup>30</sup> Ms. all̄ all̄, or al̄ al̄.

tuis. ascendit in celum. sedit ad dexteram dei pr̄is omnipotentis. Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo et in spm scm scamque aeclisiam catholicam. sanctorum communionem. remissionem peccatorum. Carnis resurrectionis vitam eternam amen."

On the back of the page, and on that opposite, are drawings of figures similar to those already described; and thus ends this very curious and valuable little volume, which cannot be considered less than a thousand years old.

Several other Ms. copies of the Latin Gospels exist in the Cambridge libraries. One (well known to Biblical students, and of which a complete fac-simile has been published) is in the Public Library, and is called the "Codex Bezae." It is a thick quarto, on strong yellowish parchment, and contains both the Greek and the Latin text in pages opposite to each other. The latter contains readings different from St. Jerome's Vulgate. The date is believed to be as early as the fifth or sixth century. In the library of Corpus Christi are preserved two others, one reputed (and with every reason believed) to be the very copy brought by St. Augustine, the Apostle of England, in 596; and the other an Irish Ms., very ancient, perhaps of the seventh, or certainly of the eighth, century. All these are in quarto, on vellum, in uncial or capital characters, large, and by no means difficult to read.

There are not many Ms. Manuals (or, as we now call them, Rituals) preserved entire. We shall, therefore, next mention the "York Manual," a folio on parchment, of the date of about 1400, in the University Library (marked Ee. iv. 19).

Among the contents of this volume are, "Benedictio salis et aquae;" "ordo ad catechumenum faciendum;" "benedictio fontis;" "de baptismo;" "ordo ad facienda sponsalia;" "ordo visitandi infirmum vel ungendi;" "commendacio mortuorum;" "de modo dicendi exequias defunctorum;" "benedictio panis." The volume ends thus: "Orate pro animabus domini joh̄is castylfurth et domini willi bramelay capellano- rum, parentum suorum et fratrum suorum, et omnium benefactorum suorum, qui dederunt istum librum huic ecclesiae sancti leonardi de —." The name<sup>31</sup> is carefully erased, and is wholly illegible. Evidently there was some *mala fides* in the later possession of the book. The letters are illuminated throughout, but not in a very rich manner, and without

<sup>31</sup> On the subject of Mss. taken or borrowed from churches or monasteries in the Middle Ages, and the precautions to prevent their alienation, see Maitland's *Dark Ages*, p. 270.



gold. As usual at this period, they are of blue and red, the latter worked with a fine pen. Some interesting specimens of old English occur in the Marriage Service, a good part of which appears to have always been addressed in the vernacular to the parties about to be united. In page 21 the following passages occur :

"Lo, brether, we er comen here be fore god and his aungels and all his halows in ye face and ye psence of haly kyrk for to copull and to knytt yise two bodys to gyder : yat es to say, of yis man and of yis woman. yat yay be fro yis tyme forthe a body<sup>32</sup> and two saules in ye faythe and in ye law of god and of haly kyrk, for to disserve to gider ay-lastand<sup>33</sup> lyfe, whatsom ever yay have done here be fore.

I charge zow on godis be halfe and hali kyrk yat if yar be any of yow yat can say any thyng whi yies two may nocht lawfully be wedded to gidere at yis time, say yt now owther privaly or apertely in ye helpyng of zour saules and yars bothe.<sup>34</sup>

Alswa I charge yow bothe and ather be your selfe, als ze will ansswere be for god at ye day of dome, yat yf yare be any thyng done privaly or openly be twene zour selfe, or yat ze know any lafull lettyng, whi yat ze may nocht be wedded to gedere at yis tyme, say it now or we do any more to yis mater.

N., wyll you have yis woman to yi wyf and luf hir and wirschepe hir and kepe hir in hele and in seknes and in all other degres. be to hir als a husband suld be to his wyf and all othere forsake, and hold ye only to hir to yi lywes ende.

N., wyll yow have yis man to yi husband and to be bwzum<sup>35</sup> to hym, luf hym, obeye to him and wirschiipe hym, serve him and kepe hym in hele and in seknes and in all other degrese."

At page 85 is an address to the people, resembling portions of the Commination Service in the Book of Common Prayer. It runs thus :

"Sententie majoris excommunicationis. At ye bygynnyg god and haly kyrk curses all yais yat ye frawnches<sup>36</sup> of haly kyrk brekes or destrubes, and all yat er agayne ye peesse or ryght or ye state of haly kirk or yar to<sup>37</sup> assentes wyth dede or counsale, and all yai yat haly kyrk pryves of ryght or makes of haly kyrk lay fee,<sup>38</sup> yat ys halud or sanctifiet. Also all yais yat wytandly<sup>39</sup> or wilfully tyndes<sup>40</sup> falsly, and yat gyves nocht to god and to haly kyrk ye tynd parte or ye tend peny of ylk a wynnyg<sup>41</sup> levefully wonne in marchandyes, or wyth any other craftes, wythdrawant anly<sup>42</sup> ye expenses and ye

<sup>32</sup> i.e. *ane* (one body).

<sup>33</sup> for everlasting.

<sup>34</sup> The Anglican Marriage Service contains much of the above, in a more modern form.

<sup>35</sup> i.e. *buzom*, comely and agreeable.

<sup>36</sup> i.e. the rights or liberties (franchises).

<sup>38</sup> lay impropriation.

<sup>40</sup> give tenths.

<sup>37</sup> thereto.

<sup>39</sup> wittingly.

<sup>41</sup> earning.

<sup>42</sup> i.e. excepting only the expense and cost necessary as outlay, not reckoning the profit of one against the loss of another, &c.

costages yat nedfully behoves be made aboute ye thyng yat ye wynnyng is getyn, noght tendeing the wynnyng of a marchandyes wyth ye losse of another."

In the Marriage Service, from which the above is taken, the Mass is given from "per omnia sæcula sæculorum" (with musical notation), and the Canon. The following rubric occurs after the "da propitius pacem in diebus nostris:"

"Postea dimittat fractiones super patenam et calice corporalibus cooperto, vertat se sacerdos ad sponsum et sponsam et dicat super eos sequentes orationes, illis genuflectentibus sub pallio super eos extento, quod teneant duo clerici in superpelliciis. Sed cum plures sunt benedicti in nupciis celebrandis, sc. in introitu ecclesiæ et super pallium et post missam et super thorum in sero,<sup>43</sup> quero que benedictio sit recitanda in secundis<sup>44</sup> nupciis et que non."

We have before remarked that Ms. Missals of an early date are extremely rare: in fact, the discovery of a complete one prior to the eleventh century is still, we believe, a desideratum. Still more rare is a complete copy of the Canon. The constant use of this made it, in old copies, generally become soiled, obliterated, or otherwise damaged, so that the renewal of it by later hands was very general. Both in Mss. and in early printed copies that have been used in churches, this (so to say) *thumbing* of the Canon is very observable. It is particularly so in the copy we now select for notice, which is in the University Library, and is marked Gg. iii. 21.

The date of this Ms., which formerly belonged to the abbey of Tewkesbury, is between 1190 and 1200. It is a rather thick quarto on vellum, with large initial letters in what is commonly known as the Lombardic character, of plain device, and alternately in red and ultramarine blue. There are no illuminations of the larger and pictorial kind. The Kalendar at the beginning is complete for the quarter from Advent to Palm Sunday, and is beautifully written. It contains occasional marginal entries, *e. g.* of several bishops of Worcester; the obit of "Edwardus Rex" (the Confessor), on the octave of the Innocents; Isabel countess of Gloucester, on Jan. 18; Mabile "comitissa" on Mar. 22. The Missal begins on fol. 11, with the usual commencement of the *Temporale* with Advent, "Ad te levavi animam meam," &c.; and *oratio*, "Excita Domine quæsumus potentiam tuam et veni," &c. The Canon occurs in the usual place, before Easter Sunday, and is complete throughout, with the exception of the first prayer, which was on a leaf that has unfortu-

<sup>43</sup> In blessing the bed in the evening.

<sup>44</sup> Marriage with a second husband or wife.



nately been cut out. The first words now are the opening of the Commemoratio pro vivis, “—lorum famularumque tuarum . ill . et omnium circumstantium, [a line here is erased] quorum tibi fides cognita est et nota devotio,” &c.

The original prefaces *sine notis* have been for the most part cut out, and a quire of vellum has been inserted by a later hand, containing the Credo, the Gloria in excelsis, and the *præfationes solemnes*, with the musical notation. The quires throughout the book consist of four sheets, or eight leaves. The original prefaces that remain occupy the first leaf; the second is cut out; and between the second and third is inserted a sheet, of which both leaves have been cut out almost to the back, so that it is difficult to say precisely what is missing.

As this Missal is some thirty years older than the so-called Registrum of St. Osmund, preserved in the Registry at Salisbury, we shall make no apology for presenting our readers with the whole of this hitherto unpublished *Canon Missæ*, as used in England in the time of King John. A careful collation of it with the Roman use will be interesting to those engaged in liturgical studies. It runs thus :

“ [Præfationes.]

[*De sancta cruce.*]

V.D. etc : Qui salutem humani generis in ligno crucis constituit : ut unde mors oriebatur . inde uita resurgeret : & qui in ligno vincebat in ligno quoque uinceretur : per xpm.

*In resurrectione domini.*

V.D. equum & salutare : Et te omni quidem tempore . sed in hac potissimum die gloriosius predicare : cum pascha nostrum immolatus est xpc. Ipse enim uerus est agnus : qui abstulit peccata mundi. Qui mortem nostram moriendo destruxit : & uitam resurgendo reparauit. Et ideo cum.

*In ascensione domini.*

V. etc : per xpm. Qui post resurrectionem suam omnibus discipulis suis manifestus apparuit : & ipsis cernentibus est eleuatus in celum : ut nos diuinitatis suæ tribueret esse participes. Et ideo.

*In pentecoste & de spiritu sancto.*

V.D. etc : per xpm. Qui ascendens super omnes celos . sedensque ad dexteram tuam : promissum spiritum sanctum hodierna die in filios adoptionis effudit. Qua propter profusis gaudiis totus in orbe terrarum mundus exultat : sed et superne uirtutes atque angelice potestates . ymnium glorie tue concinunt : sine fine dicentes.

*De trinitate & dominicis diebus.*

V. etc : Qui cum unigenito filio tuo . & spiritu sancto unus es

deus : unus es dominus. Non in unius singularitate persone : sed in unius trinitate substantie. Quod enim de tua gloria reuelante te credimus : hoc de filio tuo : hoc de spiritu sancto . sine differentia discretionis sentimus. Vt in confessione uere sempiternæ deitatis . & in personis proprietas . & inessentia unitas : & in maiestate adoretur equalitas. Quam laud.

*In fest. beate Marie.*

V.D. etc : Et te in ueneratione beate & gloriose semper uirginis marie . exultantibus animis laudare . benedicere . & predicare. Que unigenitum tuum sancti spiritus obumbratione concepit . & uirginitatis gloria permanente . huic mundo lumen eternum effudit : ihu xpm dominum nostrum . per.

*De omnibus apostolis.*

V. etc : Et te domine suppliciter exorare : ut gregem tuam pastor eterne non deseras : sed per beatos apostolos tuos continua protectione custodias . ut hisdem rectoribus gubernetur : quos operis.

[CANON MISSÆ.]

—lorum famularumque tuarum . ill. & omnium circumstantium.  
quorum tibi fides cognita  
est . & nota deuotio . pro quibus tibi offerimus . uel qui tibi offerunt  
hoc sacrificium laudis . pro se suisque omnibus . pro redemptione animarum suarum . pro spe salutis & incolumitatis sue . tibi reddunt uota sua . eterno deo . uiuo & uero.

Communicantes & memoriam uenerantes. Inprimis gloriose semper uirginis marie genitricis dei & domini nostri ihu xpi. Sed & beatorum apostolorum ac martirum tuorum Petri . Pauli . Andree . Iacobi . Iohannis . Thome . Iacobi . Philippi . Bartholomei . Mathei . Symonis & Tadei . Lini . Cleti . Clementis . Sixti . Cornelii . Cipriani . Laurentii . Crisogoni . Iohannis & Pauli . Cosme & Damiani

. Et omnium sanctorum tuorum quorum meritis precibusque concedas . ut in omnibus protectionis tue muniamur auxilio. Per eundem xpm dominum nostrum. Amen. Hanc ergo oblationem seruitutis nostre sed & cuncte familie tue quesumus . Domine ut placatus accipias. Diesque nostros in tua pace disponas . atque ab eterna damnatione nos eripi . & in electorum tuorum iubeas grege numerari . per xpm dominum nostrum. Amen. Quam oblationem tu deus in omnibus quesumus Bene $\times$ dictam . Ascrip $\times$ tam . Ra $\times$ tam . Rationabilem . acceptabilemque facere digneris . ut nobis . Cor $\times$ p $\times$ us . & San $\times$ guis . fiat dilectissimi filii tui domini nostri ihu xpi. Qui pridie quam pateretur . accepit panem in sanctas ac uenerabiles manus suas . & eleuatis oculis in celum ad te deum patrem suum omnipotentem tibi gratias agens. Bene $\times$ dixit . fregit . dedit discipulis suis dicens . accipite & manducate ex hoc omnes . hoc est enim corpus meum. Simili modo postea quam cenantum est accipiens & hunc preclarum calicem in sanctas ac uenerabiles manus suas tibi gratias agens . Bene $\times$ dixit . dedit discipulis suis dicens . accipite & bibite ex hoc omnes hic est enim calix sanguinis



mei noui & eterni testamenti mysterium fidei qui pro uobis & pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum . hec quotiens cunque feceritis . in mei memoriam facietis . Vnde et memores domine nos tui serui . sed & plebs tua sancta xpi filii tui domini dei nostri tam beate passionis . nec non et ab inferis resurrectionis sed & in celos gloriose ascensionis . offerimus preclare maiestati tue de tuis donis ac datis . Hostiam puram . Hostiam sanctam . Hostiam immaculatam . Panem sanctum uite eterne . & Calicem salutis perpetue . Supra que propicio ac sereno uultu respicere digneris . & accepta habere sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti abel . & sacrificium patriarche nostri abrahe . & quod tibi optulit summus sacerdos tuus melchisedech . sanctum sacrificium immaculatam hostiam .

Supplices te rogamus omnipotens deus . iube hec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum in conspectu diuine maiestatis tue ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum filii tui Corpus & Sanguiinem sumpserimus omni benedictione . celesti . & gratia repleamur . Per eundem xpm dominum nostrum . Amen .

Memento etiam domine famulorum famularumque tuarum N . qui nos precesserunt cum signo fidei . & dormiunt in sompno pacis . Ipsi domine & omnibus in xpo quiescentibus locum refrigerii . lucis & pacis ut indulgeas deprecamur . per eundem xpm dominum nostrum . Amen .

Nobis quoque peccatoribus famulis tuis de multitudine miserationum tuarum sperantibus . partem aliquam & societatem donare digneris cum tuis sanctis apostolis & martiribus . Cum Iohanne . Stephano . Mathia . Barnaba . Ignatio . Alexandro . Marcellino . Petro . Felicitate . Perpetua . Agatha . Lucia . Agnete . Cecilia . Anastasia . & cum omnibus sanctis tuis . intra quorum nos consortium non estimator meriti . Sed uenie quesumus largitor admitte . Per xpm dominum nostrum . Per quem hec omnia domine semper bona creas . Sancti . Viui . Benedicti . Et prestas nobis . Per ipsum . Et cum ipso . Et in ipso . est tibi deo patri omnipotenti . in unitate spiritus sancti . omnis honor & gloria .

Per omnia secula seculorum . Amen .

Oremus .

Preceptis salutaribus moniti . & diuina institutione formati : audemus dicere .

Pater noster qui es in celis . Sanctificetur nomen tuum . Adueniat regnum tuum . Fiat uoluntas tua sicut in celo & in terra . Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie . Et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris . Et ne nos inducas in temptationem . Sed libera nos a malo . Amen .

Libera nos quesumus domine ab omnibus malis preteritis presentibus . & futuris . & intercedente beata & gloriosa semper uirgine dei genitrice . Maria & beatis apostolis tuis . Petro . Paulo . atque .

Andrea cum omnibus sanctis . Da propitius pacem in diebus nostris . ut ope misericordie tue adiuti . & a peccato simus semper liberi . & ab omni perturbatione securi.

Per eundem dominum nostrum . ih̄m xp̄m filium tuum . qui tecum uiuit & regnat in unitate spiritus sancti deus. Per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

Pax domini sit semper uobiscum.

Et cum spiritu tuo.

Agnus dei qui tollis peccata mundi miserere nobis . ii.

Agnus dei qui tollis peccata mundi dona nobis pacem.

*Ante perceptionem.*

Domine sancte pater omnipotens eterne deus . da mihi hoc corpus & sanguinem filii tui domini nostri ih̄u xp̄e ita sumere . ut merear per hoc remissionem omnium peccatorum meorum accipere . & tuo sancto spiritu replei . quia tu es deus . & preter te non est alius cuius regnum gloriosum permanet in secula seculorum. Amen.

*Post perceptionem sacramenti.*

Domine ih̄u xp̄e fili dei uiui qui exuoluntate patris cooperante spiritu sancto per mortem tuam mundum uiuificasti . libera me per hoc sacrum corpus & sanguinem tuum a cunctis iniquitatibus & ab uniuersis malis . & fac me tuis semper obedire mandatis & a te nunquam inperpetuum separari. Qui uiuis & regnas cum deo patre in unitate spiritus sancti deus . per omnia secula seculorum amen.

*Oratio post missam.*

Placeat tibi sancta trinitas obsequium seruitutis mee . & presta ut hoc sacrificium quod oculis tue maiestatis indignus optuli . tibi sit acceptabile . mihiq̄ue & omnibus pro quibus illud obtuli sit te miserante propitiabile . Qui uiuis."

Before the last prayer,<sup>45</sup> inserted on a slip of vellum by a later hand, and placed so as to cover over the "Domine IHU Xpe, fili Dei vivi," &c., is the following: "Deus Pater, fons et origo totius bonitatis, qui ductus misericordia unigenitum tuum pro nobis ad infima mundi descendere et carnem sumere uoluisti, quam ego indignus hic in manibus meis teneo, te adoro, te glorifico, te tota cordis intentione laudo, et precor ut nos famulos tuos non deseras, sed ut peccata nostra dimittas, quatenus tibi soli vivo ac uero Deo puro corde ac [casto corpore seruire valeamus, per eundem Xtum]." The last words are cut out by the binder of the book, and are here supplied from the Sarum Missal.

The following also is added in the margin by a later hand, to precede "Pax Domini sit semper uobiscum:" "Hæc sacrosancta commixtio corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri

<sup>45</sup> In the printed Sarum Missal of 1494 this prayer comes before "Domine Jesu Christe," &c.



Jesu Christi fiat omnibus sumentibus salus mentis et corporis, et ad vitam eternam capessendam preparatio salutaris, per eundem Xtum."

This ancient Canon contains no rubrics at all. The apparently abrupt way in which it ends is remarkable.<sup>46</sup> Immediately after the last prayer given above, there follows, without any break whatever, the remainder of the Missal, containing the *proprium*, which is wholly an insertion in writing of the fourteenth century. All that remains of the original writing is,—“In veneratione sancte Trinitatis; De Sancto Spiritu; De Sancta Cruce;” and “De Sancta Maria,” with the first few words of which the quire comes to an end.

Another Ms. Missal in the Public Library<sup>47</sup> is remarkable not only as being different from any of the known English “uses” (as a collation of it with Mr. Maskell’s book shows), but as presenting an example of a Processional and a Missal combined. This Ms. is rather closely written in double columns, and is a moderate-sized quarto. The date is probably from 1380 to 1400. It is tolerably perfect, with the exception of a leaf lost between fol. 131 and 132, and is generally in a good condition. The illuminations are in red and blue, and very numerous, but confined to the initial letters.

The Missal begins (after the Calendar and the Blessing of the Holy Water) with Advent, as usual; and after Holy Week, the Prefaces with *infra canonem* (i.e. “infra actionem”) occur, followed by the Canon. After the preface to Trinity Sunday, the *infra canonem* and part of the ordinarium are wanting. It now begins, “mariae et omnibus sanctis et vobis peccavi [*sic*] nimis cogitatione locutione et opere. mea culpa. ideo precor vos orare,” &c. The rest is according to Hereford use, with a few slight additions. But it has the prayer “Domine sancte pater,” which is according to the Sarum, and not to the York or Hereford, use; and also “Domine Jesu Christe fili dei vivi,” which is in the Sarum. But it differs in

<sup>46</sup> The words with which the Mass now ends, “Ite Missa est,” do not seem to be very ancient as a conclusion. In fact, the interpretation commonly given, “Go; you are dismissed” (though it serves very well to express the present mind and usage of the Church), cannot be the real meaning. The words seem to have been addressed to the catechumens, before the Canon commenced, in this sense, “Go; it is the Mass;” i.e. now about to commence in its most solemn part. There is no doubt that *Missa* here means “The Mass,” and is not a participle, with “congregatio” to be supplied; such an expression would not be Latin. It is remarkable that the etymology of *Missa* is quite unknown. We have the same word, probably, in *mess* and *messmate*; but we are not aware that any more plausible derivation has yet been assigned than *mensa*.

<sup>47</sup> Marked Ff. iv. 44.

other details rather considerably. The Mass ends thus: "Tunc erigat se sacerdos et signet se in faciem dicens. In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen. Hic paululum inclinet altari et sic RECEDAT."

The "Proprium" begins at fol. 159, and the "Commune Sanctorum" at fol. 207. At fol. 239 is the Ordo ad facienda sponsalia; after which comes the Officium pro iter agentibus, Ordo ad visitandum infirmum, De extrema unctione, Commendacio animæ, and Ad Missam mortuorum, followed by a series of private Masses.

The Canon contains rubrics throughout, which also differ from the known ancient uses. They are distinguished by being underlined in red.

It does not appear that in the old Missals generally the "Ite Missa est" is added. But in the present instance we find this given in a rubric immediately after the ordinarium *in Sabbato Sancto*: "Et sic missa cum Vespere simul finiatur, diacono dicente, Ite missa est."

Immediately after this follows the *Credo*, then the "Communicantes et memoriam dominicæ passionis ob reverenciam et virtutem sanctæ eucharistiæ recolentes; quam dominus in sua sancta domo pro omnium salute in specie panis et vini constituit et consecravit. sed et memoriam." Then we have short sentences, with musical notation, followed by "Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ, sed et cunctæ familiæ tuæ quam pretio corporis tui sacratissimi et gloriosissimi sanguinis tui redemisti, quorum misteria discipulis tuis divinitus tradidisti celebranda, quæsumus domine ut placatus."

The prefaces, with *infra canonem*, here follow. A portion of the "Sursum corda," with musical notation, is cut out, as well as the first words of the Canon on the other side of the leaf.

There are no rubrics to the consecration, except "Hic teneat sacerdos calicem inter manus suas, dicens" [Simili modo, &c.], and "Hic sacerdos elevet brachia sua in modum crucis."

Of ancient Psalters there are several specimens in the Cambridge libraries. There is one at St. John's, one at Trinity, and one in the University Library, all of the Anglo-Saxon period. The two latter are interlined with Saxon glosses. That in the Public Library<sup>48</sup> is a small thick folio on vellum, containing 552 pages. The writing is in a large, bold, and very distinct hand, the Saxon characters being used throughout, both in the text and the interlined gloss; the former is written in black, the latter in red ink. This Ms.

<sup>48</sup> Marked Ff. i. 23.



(which was used by Sir Henry Spelman for his edition) formerly belonged to Sir Nicolas Bacon, lord-keeper of the great seal, to whom it was given (as stated at the beginning of the book) by Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, and left by him to the University in 1574. This is a Ms. of rare value and interest. The date assigned to it is "early in the xith century;" but it seems to us that it may be about a century later, *i.e.* about 1130 to 1150. There is a large and very interesting illumination, or rather pen-and-ink drawing, touched with colour, as the frontispiece. On the back of it is a page of writing in a smaller, but apparently identical, hand, being "Orationes et preces ante psalterium." (These prayers are three in number, in Latin.) The illumination consists of a figure of King David, under a trefoiled arch,<sup>49</sup> with a richly interlaced and foliated border and corner ornaments. King David is seated on a throne, or rather sofa, with a netted or diapered back, and is holding a twelve-stringed harp. On his head is a conical cap, surmounted with a plume or peak, the whole representing a tiara. A dove is flying with outstretched neck towards his mouth—a representation of divine inspiration. On each side of the king is a figure, one with a fiddle, and inscribed in capital letters ASAPH; the other with a kind of sackbut or lute, and entitled EMAN. Over David is the title DAVID REX. Below, and on the lower half of the page, are two other figures, one of whom is playing a horn with stops like a flute, and the other holds a small semicircular kettle-drum with two sticks. The name to the former is ETHAN; to the latter, IDITHUN.<sup>50</sup> This picture is excellently and artistically worked out with a pen, and is picked out with red and brown paint. The opposite page is also illuminated, the initial B, in *Beatus Vir* (these words, except the B, in red letters), being about five inches long, most curiously and intricately designed and interlaced with scroll-work. The colours used in this page are red, brown, and yellow; and, like the preceding, it has a rich border all round.

As a specimen of the text, we give the first two verses of Psalm i. with the interlined glossary:

*eadig wer se ne gewat in getheachte arleasra and on*  
*Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum et in*  
*wege synfultra na stod and on thrymsetle cwyldes na sæt.*  
*via peccatorum non stetit et in cathedra pestilentie non sedit.*

<sup>49</sup> Such as occurs in very early Norman architecture, but hardly, we think, in Saxon work.

<sup>50</sup> These names (of musicians) occur in the titles to the Psalms in our Vulgate.

ac on æ drihnys was willa hys and on æ  
 Sed in lege domini fuit voluntas ejus, et in lege  
 hys bythsinead dagys and nihtes.  
 ejus meditabitur die ac nocte [sic].

Each psalm has a smaller capital letter, and a title in green ink, e.g. "Salmus David de increpatione" (Dixit Dominus, &c.); "Salmus David, vox Xti in ecclesia" (In te Domine speravi). Often there is simply "in finem Salmus David."<sup>51</sup> At the end of "Miserere mei" (fol. 167) is a whole-page illustration of the Crucifixion, a most interesting drawing of early art. On the Cross is inscribed "Lignum vitæ." Above, the sun and moon are represented as muffling with garments their human countenances. A hand is pointing downwards from heaven. Our Lady and St. John are very well drawn and draped, and are inscribed MARIA VIRGO and JOHANN. St. John holds a book with "Ego vidi et testimonium," in very minute Saxon letters, on the back. Our Lord is also finely and impressively drawn. He has the cruciform nimbus, the others the plain nimbus. The colours used are green and red. A border is carried all round. On the reverse is a large illuminated letter and bordered page to the psalm "Quid gloriaris" (Ps. li.).

On fol. 332, before "Domine exaudi orationem meam" (ci.), which has also an illuminated page and border, is a figure of the Lord in a *vesica piscis*, with two flying angels above, and two standing angels below, supporting it. All these are very well drawn. The central figure has the hand upraised, and carries a label and a book. On the label is "Ego sum Deus qui reddo unicuique juxta sua opera." This page also is ornamented with a border of interlacing scroll-work, in red and green.

On fol. 380, before the psalm "Dixit Dominus" (cix.), there is a full-length standing figure of Christ holding a crosier and a book inscribed with "Super aspidem et basiliscum ambulabis." The drapery is not very well treated, yet the drawing is a clever one. Our Lord is treading upon two dragons (the asp and the basilisk), and has the cruciform nimbus. The colours are red and green.

Besides the entire Psalms, this volume contains several other pieces, beginning with fol. 491. These are, the Hymn of Isaiah (Is. xii.), with some other canticles from the old Scriptures, the "Benedicite omnia opera," the "Magnificat," the "Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel," "Te Deum," "Nunc dimittis" (the last two without the Saxon glossary, and so on

<sup>51</sup> Many, if not all, of these headings occur in the Psalms of the Vulgate.



to the Creed), "Gloria in excelsis," "Pater noster," "Apostles' Creed," the "Athanasian Creed," "Litany of the Saints," "Oratio post salterium;" "Oratio de Sancta Trinitate;" two prayers, "De Sancta Cruce," "Oratio de Sancta Maria;" two more prayers on the same; prayers to the Archangels Michael, Gabriel, Raphael severally; prayer to the Guardian Angel, and "Ad Sanctos Angelos;" prayer to St. John Baptist, "De S. Petro, de Paulo Apostolo," and "Ad Sanctum Andream."<sup>52</sup>

We print two of these prayers; hitherto, we believe, unpublished: X

Fol. 545. "Dei genetrix domina mea beata Maria te deprecor per Christum Jesum Dominum ut miserearis mihi peccatori famulo tuo N., quia multiplicata sunt peccata mea super numerum arene maris, et non habeo ubi confugiam nisi ad te domina mea, Sancta Maria; ideo flexibiliter<sup>53</sup> peto ut<sup>54</sup> Dominum Deum nostrum pro me intercedere digneris, quatenus per tuas sanctas orationes omnia peccata mea dimittere dignetur.

Oratio.

Sancta Maria, gloriosa Dei genetrix, et virgo semper, que mundo meruisti generare salutem, et lucem mundi celorumque gloriam<sup>55</sup> obtulisti sedentibus in tenebris et umbra mortis; esto mihi pia dominatrix et cordis mei illuminatrix et adjutrix apud Deum Patrem omnipotentem, ut veniam delictorum meorum accipere et inferni tenebras evadere et ad vitam eternam pervenire merear. Per eundem."

We have only space to mention briefly another copy of a Ms. Psalter, also in the University Library. This is a very large and beautiful folium on vellum,<sup>56</sup> richly illuminated throughout, in burnished gold and colours, in the style of the end of the fifteenth century. It has immensely wide margins, and has evidently been a very costly work. The text is in a large and bold black-letter, with the initial letters illuminated to every psalm, and, in a smaller pattern, to every verse. Occasionally there is a very large and pictorial illuminated letter. Thus, at the Psalm *Dixit insipiens* (xiii.) there is a portrait, within the large initial D, of a fool or jester in a harlequin particoloured dress, and wearing a cap with bell and asses' ears, talking to a king attired in his state robes with crown and sceptre. At *Cantate Domino* (xcvii.) is a picture of a priest in a cope singing Office from a large book on a lectern. Behind him are three tonsured priests in surplices, one of whom holds a pair of spectacles, bent

<sup>52</sup> The printed catalogue merely says, "The rest of the volume is occupied with prayers in Latin." Why not specify them?

<sup>53</sup> i.e. *suppliciter*.

<sup>54</sup> Perhaps, "ut *apud*," &c.

<sup>55</sup> Ms. a full stop after *gloriam*.

<sup>56</sup> Marked Dd. viii. 18.

across the bridge of the nose, in order to see the notes in the office-book.

Though late, this Ms. is a fine specimen of art. Generally, the finest illuminations seem to occur between the time of Edward II. and Henry VII. There are, however, some splendid examples of illuminations as early as Henry III.; one of which is a pictorial life of Edward the Confessor, in the Public Library at Cambridge. The use of burnished gold, we believe, though introduced early, did not become very common till about 1300. The gold used must have been perfectly pure, as it generally remains to this day as bright as when it left the burnisher of the artist, more than five centuries ago.<sup>57</sup> Illuminations are generally of two kinds: letters simply painted in body-colours, with scroll-work filled in by the pen (the colours being red and blue); and miniature pictures, often very exquisite works of art, containing many colours, and more or less associated with borders and grounds of gold. The former are principally characteristic of the fourteenth, the latter of the fifteenth century.

---

<sup>57</sup> In the library of St. Peter's College there is a copy of an immense folio Latin Bible, printed in 1463 (one of the first books ever printed). It is on *vellum*, and the illuminations are supplied by the hand. This is a splendid, and perhaps almost unique, volume. The burnished gold is quite as bright as if it had been done yesterday.



## CARDINAL WISEMAN AND THE HOME AND FOREIGN REVIEW.<sup>1</sup>

IT is one of the conditions inseparable from a public career to be often misunderstood, and sometimes judged unfairly even when understood the best. No one who has watched the formation of public opinion will be disposed to attribute all the unjust judgments which assail him to the malice of individuals, or to imagine that he can prevent misconceptions or vindicate his good name by words alone. He knows that even where he has committed no errors he must pay tribute to the fallibility of mankind, and that where he is in fault he must also pay tribute to his own. This is a natural law; and the purer a man's conscience is, and the more single his aim, the less eager will he be to evade it, or to defend himself from its penalties. The man whose career is bound up with that of some school or party will estimate the value of his opponents' censures by the worth which he attributes to the indiscriminating praise of his friends; but he who has devoted himself to the development of principles which will not always bend to the dictates of expediency will have no such short way of dealing with objections. His independence will frequently and inexorably demand the sacrifice of interests to truth—of what is politic to what is right; and, whenever he makes that sacrifice, he will appear a traitor to those whom he is most anxious to serve, while his act will be hailed by those who are farthest from sharing his opinions as a proof of secret sympathy, and a harbinger of future alliance. Thus, the censure which he incurs will most often come from those whose views are essentially his own; and the very matter which calls it forth will be that which elicits the applause of adversaries who cannot bring themselves to believe either in the truth of his opinions, in the integrity of his motives, or in the sincerity of his aims.

There are few men living whose career has been more persistently misinterpreted, more bitterly assailed, or more ignorantly judged, than the illustrious person who is the head in England of the Church to which we belong. Cardinal Wiseman has been for many years the chief object of

<sup>1</sup> Rome and the Catholic Episcopate. Reply of His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman to an Address presented by the Clergy, secular and regular, of the Archdiocese of Westminster, on Tuesday the 5th of August 1862. London: Burns and Lambert.

the attacks of those who have desired to injure or degrade our community. He is not only the canonical chief of English Catholics, but his ability, and the devotion of his life to their cause, have made him their best representative and their most powerful champion. No prelate in Christendom is more fully trusted by the Holy See, or exercises a more extensive personal influence, or enjoys so wide a literary renown. Upon him, therefore, intolerance and fanaticism have concentrated their malice. He has had to bear the brunt of that hatred which the holiness of Catholicism inspires in its enemies; and the man who has never been found wanting when the cause of the Church was at stake may boast, with a not unworthy pride, of the indifference with which he has encountered the personal slander of a hostile press.

The Catholics of this country are attached to Cardinal Wiseman by warmer feelings and more personal ties than those of merely ecclesiastical subordination. It has been his privilege to gather the spiritual fruits of the Catholic Emancipation Act; and the history of English Catholicism has been, for a whole generation, bound up with his name. That immense change in the internal condition of the Church in England which distinguishes our days from the time of Milner has grown up under his influence, and has been in great part his work. We owe it to him that we have been brought into closer intercourse with Rome, and into contact with the rest of Europe. By his preaching and his spiritual direction he has transformed the devotions of our people; while his lectures and writings have made Protestants familiar with Catholic ideas, and have given Catholics a deeper insight into their own religion. As a controversialist, he influenced the Oxford movement more deeply than any other Catholic. As director of the chief literary organ of Catholics during a quarter of a century, he rendered services to our literature, and overcame difficulties, which none are in a better position to appreciate than those who are engaged in a similar work. And as President of Oscott, he acquired the enduring gratitude of hundreds who owed to his guidance the best portion of their training. These personal relations with English Catholics, which have made him a stranger to none and a benefactor to all, have at the same time given him an authority of peculiar weight amongst them. With less unity of view and tradition than their brethren in other lands, they are accustomed, in common with the rest of Englishmen, to judge more independently, and to speak more freely, than is often possible in countries more



exclusively Catholic. Their minds are not all cast in the same mould, nor their ideas derived from the same stock; but all alike, from bishop to layman, identify their cause with that of the Cardinal, and feel that, in the midst of a hostile people, no diversity of opinion ought to interfere with unity of action, no variety of interest with identity of feeling, no controversy with the universal reverence which is due to the position and character of the Archbishop of Westminster.

In this spirit the Catholic body have received Cardinal Wiseman's latest publication—his Reply to the Address of his Clergy on his return from Rome. He speaks in it of the great assemblage of the Episcopate, and of their address to the Holy Father. Among the Bishops there present he was the most conspicuous, and he was President of the Commission to which the preparation of their address was intrusted. No account of it, therefore, can be more authentic than that which he is able to give. The reserve imposed by his office, and by the distinguished part he had to bear, has been to some extent neutralised by the necessity of refuting false and exaggerated rumours which were circulated soon after the meeting, and particularly two articles which appeared in the *Patrie* on the 4th and 5th of July, and in which it was stated that the address written by Cardinal Wiseman contained "most violent attacks on all modern principles, fundamental of society." After replying in detail to the untruths of this newspaper, the Cardinal proceeds as follows:

"With far greater pain I feel compelled to advert to a covert insinuation of the same charges, in a publication avowedly Catholic, and edited in my own Diocese, consequently canonically subject to my correction. Should such a misstatement, made under my own eyes, be passed over by me, it might be surmised that it could not be contradicted; and, whether chronologically it preceded or followed the French account, it evidently becomes my duty to notice it, as French Bishops have considered it theirs, to correct the inaccuracies of their native writers. Otherwise, in a few years, we might find reference made, as to a recognised Catholic authority, for the current and unproved statement of what occurred at Rome, to this 'Home and Foreign Review.' And that in a matter on which reprehension would have been doubly expected, if merited. In its first number, the Address, which has, I believe, wonderfully escaped the censure of Protestant and infidel journals, is thus spoken of.

'This Address is said to be a compromise between one which took the violent course of recommending, that major excommunication should be at once pronounced against the chief enemies of the temporal power by name, and one still more moderate than the present.'—(*The Home and Foreign Review*, p. 269). Now this very

charge about recommending excommunication is the one made by the French paper against my Address. But, leaving to the writer the chance of an error, in this application of his words, I am bound to correct it, to whomever it refers. He speaks of only *two* addresses : the distinction between them implies severe censure on *one*. I assure you that *neither* contained the recommendation or the sentiment alluded to.

My Brethren, I repeat, that it pains me to have to contradict the repetition, in my own Diocese, of foreign accusations, without the smallest pains taken to verify or disprove them with means at hand. But this can hardly excite surprise in us who know the antecedents of that journal under another name, the absence for years of all reserve or reverence in its treatment of persons or of things deemed sacred, its grazing ever the very edges of the most perilous abysses of error, and its habitual preferences of uncatholic to catholic instincts, tendencies, and motives. In uttering these sad thoughts, and entreating you to warn your people, and especially the young, against such dangerous leadership, believe me I am only obeying a higher direction than my own impulses, and acting under much more solemn sanctions. Nor shall I stand alone in this unhappily necessary correction.

But let us pass to more cheerful and consoling thoughts. If my connection with the preparation of the Address, from my having held, though unworthy, office in its committee, enables and authorises me to rebut false charges against it, it has further bestowed upon me the privilege of personal contact with a body of men, who justly represented the entire Episcopate, and would have represented it with equal advantage in any other period of the Church. I know not who selected them, nor do I venture to say that many other equal Committees, of eighteen, could not have been extracted from the remainder. I think they might ; but I must say that a singular wisdom seemed to me to have presided over the actual, whatever might have been any other possible, choice.

Deliberations more minute, more mutually respectful, more courteous, or at the same time more straightforward and unflinching, could hardly have been carried on. More learning in theology and canon law, more deep religious feeling, a graver sense of the responsibility laid upon the Commission, or a more scrupulous regard to the claims of justice, and no less of mercy, could scarcely have been exhibited. Its spirit was one of mildness, of gentleness, and of reverence to who rightly claimed it. 'Violent courses,' invitations to 'draw the sword and rush on enemies,' or to deal about 'the major excommunication by name,' I deliberately assure you, were never mentioned, never insinuated, and I think I may say, never thought of by any one in that council. In the sketches proposed by several, there was not a harsh, or disrespectful word about any sovereign, or government ; in any thing I ever humbly proposed, there was not a single allusion to 'King or Kaiser.'"

Our duty to the Cardinal and our duty to our readers



alike forbid us to pass by these remarks without notice. Silence would imply either that we admitted the charge, or that we disregarded the censure; and each of these suppositions would probably be welcome to the enemies of our common cause, while both of them are, in fact, untrue. The impossibility of silence, however, involves the necessity of our stating the facts on which charges so definite and so formidable have been founded. In doing so, we shall endeavour both to exhibit the true sequence of events, and to explain the origin of the Cardinal's misapprehension; and in this way we shall reply to the charges made against us.

But we must first explicitly declare, as we have already implied, that in the Cardinal's support and approbation of our work we should recognise an aid more valuable to the cause we are engaged in than the utmost support which could be afforded to us by any other person; and that we cannot consider the terms he has used respecting us otherwise than as a misfortune to be profoundly regretted, and a blow which might seriously impair our power to do service to religion. A Catholic Review which is deprived of the countenance of the ecclesiastical authorities is placed in an abnormal position. A germ of distrust is planted in the ground where the good seed should grow; the support which the suspected organ endeavours to lend to the Church is repudiated by the ecclesiastical rulers; and its influence in Protestant society, as an expositor of Catholic ideas, is in danger of being destroyed, because its exposition of them may be declared unsound and unfair, even when it represents them most faithfully and defends them most successfully. The most devoted efforts of its conductors are liable to be misconstrued, and perversely turned either against the Church or against the Review itself; its best works are infected with the suspicion with which it is regarded; and its merits become almost more perilous than its faults.

These considerations could not have been overlooked by the Cardinal, when he resolved to take a step which threatened to paralyse one of the few organs of Catholic opinion in England. Yet he took that step. If an enemy had done this, it would have been enough to vindicate ourselves, and to leave the burden of an unjust accusation to be borne by its author. But since it has been done by an ecclesiastical superior, with entire foresight of the grave consequences of the act, it has become necessary for us, in addition, to explain the circumstances by which he was led into a course we have so much reason to deplore, and to show how an erroneous and unjust opinion could arise in the mind of

one whom obvious motives would have disposed to make the best use of a publication, the conductors of which are labouring to serve the community he governs, and desired and endeavoured to obtain his sanction for their work. If we were unable to reconcile these two necessities,—if we were compelled to choose between a forbearance dishonourable to ourselves, and a refutation injurious to the Cardinal, we should be placed in a painful and almost inextricable difficulty. For a Catholic who defends himself at the expense of an ecclesiastical superior, sacrifices that which is generally of more public value than his own fair fame; and an English Catholic who casts back on Cardinal Wiseman the blame unjustly thrown on himself, hurts a reputation which belongs to the whole body, and disgraces the entire community of Catholics. By such a course, a Review which exists only for public objects would stultify its own position and injure its own cause; and *The Home and Foreign Review* has no object to attain, and no views to advance, except objects and views in which the Catholic Church is interested. The ends for which it labours, according to its light and ability, are ends by which the Church cannot but gain; the doctrine it receives, and the authority it obeys, are none other than those which command the acceptance and submission of the Cardinal himself. It desires to enjoy his support; it has no end to gain by opposing him. It desires to be with him; it refuses to be against him. But we are not in this painful dilemma. We can show that the accusations of the Cardinal are unjust; and, at the same time, we can explain how naturally the suppositions on which they are founded have arisen, by giving a distinct and ample statement of our own principles and position.

The complaint which the Cardinal makes against us contains, substantially, five charges:—1. that we made a misstatement, affirming something historically false to be historically true; 2. that the falsehood consists in the statement that only two addresses were proposed in the Commission,—one violent, the other very moderate,—and that the address finally adopted was a compromise between these two; 3. that we insinuated that the Cardinal himself was the author of the violent address; 4. that we cast, by implication, a severe censure on that address and its author; and 5. that our narrative was derived from the same sources, and inspired by the same motives, as that given in the *Patrie*,—for the Cardinal distinctly connects the two accounts, and quotes passages indifferently from both, in such



a way that words which we never used might by a superficial reader be supposed to be ours.

To these charges our reply is as follows:—1. We gave the statement of which the Cardinal complains as a mere rumour; it was the only rumour current on any good authority at the time of our publication; and we employed every means in our power to test its accuracy, though the only other narratives which had then reached England were, as the Cardinal says (p. 9) too “partial and perverted” to enable us to sift it to the bottom. We stated that a rumour was current, not that its purport was true. 2. We did not speak of “only two addresses” actually submitted to the Commission. We supposed the report to mean, that of the three possible forms of address, two extreme and one mean, each of which actually had partisans in the Commission, the middle or moderate form was the one finally adopted. 3. We had no suspicion that the Cardinal had proposed any violent address at all; we did not know that such a proposal had been, or was about to be, attributed to him; and there was no connection whatever between him and it either in our mind or in our language. 4. We implied no censure either on the course proposed or on its proposer, still less on the Cardinal personally. 5. The articles in the *Patrie* first appeared—and that in France—some days after our Review was in the hands of the public; we know nothing of the authority on which their statements were founded, and we have not the least sympathy either with the politics or the motives of that newspaper.

This reply would be enough for our own defence; but it is right that we should show, on the other side, how it came to pass that the Cardinal was led to subject our words to that construction which we have so much reason to regret. Reading them by the light of his own knowledge, and through the medium of the false reports which afterwards arose with regard to himself, his interpretation of them may easily have appeared both plausible and likely. For there were more draft addresses than one; one was his; the actual address was a compromise between them; and he had been falsely accused of, and severely censured for, proposing violent courses in his address. Knowing this, he was tempted to suspect a covert allusion to himself under our words, and the chronological relation between our own article and those of the *Patrie* was easily forgotten, or made nugatory by the supposition of their both being derived from the same sources of information.

But this will be made clearer by the following narrative

of facts. A Commission was appointed to draw up the address of the Bishops; Cardinal Wiseman, its president, proposed a draft address, which was not obnoxious to any of the criticisms made on any other draft, and is, in substance, the basis of the address as it was ultimately settled. It was favourably received by the Commission; but, after some deliberation, its final adoption was postponed. Subsequently, a prelate who had been absent from the previous discussion presented another draft, not in competition with that proposed by the president, nor as an amendment to it, but simply as a basis for discussion. This second draft was also favourably received; and the Commission, rather out of consideration for the great services and reputation of its author than from any dissatisfaction with the address proposed by the president, resolved to amalgamate the two drafts. All other projects were set aside; and, in particular, two proposals were deliberately rejected. One of these proposals was, to pay a tribute of acknowledgment for the services of the French nation to the Holy See; the other was, to denounce the perfidious and oppressive policy of the Court of Turin in terms which we certainly should not think either exaggerated or undeserved. We have neither right nor inclination to complain of the ardent patriotism which has been exhibited by the illustrious Bishop of Orleans in the two publications he has put forth since his return to his see, or of the indignation which the system prevailing at Turin must excite in every man who in his heart loves the Church, or whose intelligence can appreciate the first principles of government. Whatever may have been the censure proposed, it certainly did not surpass the measure of the offence. Nevertheless, the impolicy of a violent course, which could not fail to cause irritation, and to aggravate the difficulties of the Church, appears to have been fully recognised by the Commission; and we believe that no one was more prompt in exposing the inutility of such a measure than the Cardinal himself. The idea that any thing imprudent or aggressive was to be found in his draft is contradicted by all the facts of the case, and has not a shadow of foundation in any thing that is contained in the address as adopted.

We need say no more to explain what has been very erroneously called our covert insinuation. From this narrative of facts our statement comes out, no longer as a mere report, but as a substantially accurate summary of events, questioned only on one point,—the *extent* of the censure which was proposed. So that in the account which the Cardinal quoted from our pages there was no substantial



statement to correct, as in fact no correction of any definite point but one has been attempted.

How this innocent statement has come to be suspected of a hostile intent, and to be classed with the calumnies of the *Patrie*, is another question. The disposition with which the Cardinal sat in judgment upon our words was founded, not on any thing they contained, but, as he declares, on the antecedents of the conductors of *The Home and Foreign Review*, and on the character of a journal which no longer exists. That character he declares to consist in "the absence for years of all reserve or reverence in its treatment of persons or of things deemed sacred, its grazing ever the very edges of the most perilous abysses of error, and its habitual preferences of uncatholic to catholic instincts, tendencies, and motives." In publishing this charge, which amounts to a declaration that we hold opinions, and display a spirit, not compatible with an entire attachment and submission of intellect and will to the doctrine and authority of the Catholic Church, the Cardinal adds, "I am only obeying a higher direction than my own impulses, and acting under much more solemn sanctions. Nor shall I stand alone in this unhappily necessary correction."

There can be little doubt of the nature of the circumstances to which this announcement points. It is said that certain papers or propositions, which the report does not specify, have been extracted from the journal which the Cardinal identifies with this Review, and forwarded to Rome for examination; that the Prefect of Propaganda has characterised these extracts, or some of them, in terms which correspond to the Cardinal's language; and that the English Bishops have deliberated whether they should issue similar declarations. We have no reason to doubt that the majority of them share the Cardinal's view, which is also that of a large portion both of the rest of the clergy and also of the laity; and, whatever may be the precise action which has been taken in the matter, it is unquestionable that a very formidable mass of ecclesiastical authority and popular feeling is united against certain principles or opinions which, whether rightly or wrongly, are attributed to us. No one will suppose that an impression so general can be entirely founded on a mistake. Those who admit the bare orthodoxy of our doctrine will, under the circumstances, naturally conclude that in our way of holding or expounding it there must be something new and strange, unfamiliar and bewildering, to those who are accustomed to the prevalent spirit of Catholic

literature; something which our fellow Catholics are not prepared to admit; something which can sufficiently explain misgivings so commonly and so sincerely entertained. Others may perhaps imagine that we are unconsciously shifting away from the Church, or that we only professedly and hypocritically remain with her. But the Catholic critic will not forget that charity is a fruit of our religion, and that his anxiety to do justice to those from whom he must differ ought always to be in equal proportion with his zeal. Relying, then, upon this spirit of fairness, convinced of the sincerity of the opposition we encounter, and in order that there may remain a distinct and intelligible record of the aim to which we dedicate our labours, we proceed to make that declaration which may be justly asked of nameless writers, as a testimony of the purpose which has inspired our undertaking, and an abiding pledge of our own consistency.

This Review has been begun on a foundation which its conductors can never abandon without treason to their own convictions, and infidelity to the objects they have publicly avowed. That foundation is a humble faith in the infallible teaching of the Catholic Church, a devotion to her cause which controls every other interest, and an attachment to her authority which no other influence can supplant. If in any thing published by us a passage can be found which is contrary to that doctrine, incompatible with that devotion, or disrespectful to that authority, we sincerely retract and lament it. No such passage was ever consciously admitted into the pages either of the late *Rambler* or of this Review. But undoubtedly we may have committed errors in judgment, and admitted errors of fact; such mistakes are unavoidable in secular matters; and no one is exempt from them in spiritual things, except by the constant assistance of Divine grace. Our wish and purpose are not to deny faults, but to repair them; to instruct, not to disturb our readers; to take down the barriers which shut out our Protestant countrymen from the Church, not to raise up divisions within her pale; and to confirm and deepen, not to weaken, alter, or circumscribe the faith of Catholics.

The most exalted methods of serving religion do not lie in the path of a periodical which addresses a general audience. The appliances of the spiritual life belong to a more retired sphere—that of the priesthood, of the sacraments, of religious offices; that of prayer, meditation, and self-examination. They are profaned by exposure, and choked by the distrac-



tions of public affairs. The world cannot be taken into the confidence of our inner life, nor can the discussion of ascetic morality be complicated with the secular questions of the day. To make the attempt would be to usurp and degrade a holier office. The function of the journalist is on another level. He may toil in the same service, but not in the same rank, as the master-workman. His tools are coarser, his method less refined; and if his range is more extended, his influence is less intense. Literature, like government, assists religion, but it does so indirectly, and from without. The ends for which it works are distinct from those of the Church, and yet subsidiary to them; and the more independently each force achieves its own end, the more complete will the ultimate agreement be found, and the more will religion profit. The course of a periodical publication in its relation to the Church is defined by this distinction of ends; its sphere is limited by the difference and inferiority of the means which it employs; while the need for its existence and its independence is vindicated by the necessity there is for the service it performs.

It is the peculiar mission of the Church to be the channel of grace to each soul by her spiritual and pastoral action—she alone has this mission; but it is not her only work. She has also to govern and educate, so far as government and education are needful subsidiaries to her great work of the salvation of souls. By her discipline, her morality, her law, she strives to realise the divine order upon earth; while by her intellectual labour she seeks an ever fuller knowledge of the works, the ideas, and the nature of God. But the ethical and intellectual offices of the Church, as distinct from her spiritual office, are not hers exclusively or peculiarly. They were discharged, however imperfectly, before she was founded; and they are discharged still, independently of her, by two other authorities, science and society. The Church cannot perform all these functions by herself; nor, consequently, can she absorb their direction. The political and intellectual orders remain permanently distinct from the spiritual. They follow their own ends, they obey their own laws, and in doing so they support the cause of religion by the discovery of truth and the upholding of right. They render this service by fulfilling their own ends independently and unrestrictedly, not by surrendering them for the sake of spiritual interests. Whatever diverts government and science from their own spheres, or leads religion to usurp their domains, confounds distinct authorities, and imperils not only political right and

scientific truth, but also the cause of faith and morals. A government that, for the interests of religion, disregards political right, and a science that, for the sake of protecting faith, wavers and dissembles in the pursuit of knowledge, are instruments at least as well adapted to serve the cause of falsehood as to combat it, and never can be used in furtherance of the truth, without that treachery to principle which is a sacrifice too costly to be made for the service of any interest whatever.

Again: the principles of religion, government, and science are in harmony, always and absolutely; but their interests are not. And though all other interests must yield to those of religion, no principle can succumb to any interest. A political law or a scientific truth may be perilous to the morals or the faith of individuals; but it cannot on this ground be resisted by the Church. It may at times be a duty of the State to protect freedom of conscience; yet this freedom may be a temptation to apostasy. A discovery may be made in science which will shake the faith of thousands; yet religion cannot refute it or object to it. The difference in this respect between a true and a false religion is, that one judges all things by the standard of their truth, the other by the touchstone of its own interests. A false religion fears the progress of all truth; a true religion seeks and recognises truth wherever it can be found, and claims the power of regulating and controlling, not the progress, but the dispensation of knowledge. The Church both accepts the truth, and prepares the individual to receive it.

The religious world has been long divided upon this great question:—Do we find principles in politics and in science? Are their methods so rigorous that we may not bend them, their conclusions so certain that we may not dissemble them, in presence of the more rigorous necessity of the salvation of souls, and the more certain truth of the dogmas of faith? This question divides Protestants into rationalists and pietists. The Church solves it in practice, by admitting the truths and the principles in the gross, and by dispensing them in detail as men can bear them. She admits the certainty of the mathematical method; and she uses the historical and critical method in establishing the documents of her own revelation and tradition. Deny this method, and her recognised arguments are destroyed. But the Church cannot and will not deny the validity of the methods upon which she is obliged to depend, not indeed for her existence, but for her demonstration. There



is no opening for Catholics to deny, in the gross, that political science may have absolute principles of right, or intellectual science of truth.

During the last hundred years Catholic literature has passed through three phases in relation to this question. At one time, when absolutism and infidelity were in the ascendant, and the Church was oppressed by governments and reviled by the people, Catholic writers imitated, and even caricatured, the early Christian apologists in endeavouring to represent their system in the light most acceptable to one side or the other, to disguise antagonism, to modify old claims, and to display only that side of their religion which was likely to attract toleration and goodwill. Nothing which could give offence was allowed to appear. Something of the fulness, if not of the truth, of religion was sacrificed for the sake of conciliation.

The great Catholic revival of the present century gave birth to an opposite school. The attitude of timidity and concession was succeeded by one of confidence and triumph. Conciliation passed into defiance. The unscrupulous falsehoods of the eighteenth century had thrown suspicion on all that had ever been advanced by the adversaries of religion; and the belief that nothing could be said for the Church gradually died away into the conviction that nothing which was said against her could be true. A school of writers arose strongly imbued with a horror of the calumnies of infidel philosophers and hostile controversialists, and animated by a sovereign desire to revive and fortify the spirit of Catholics. They became literary advocates. Their only object was to accomplish the great work before them; and they were often careless in statement, rhetorical and illogical in argument, too positive to be critical, and too confident to be precise. In this school the present generation of Catholics was educated; to it they owe the ardour of their zeal, the steadfastness of their faith, and their Catholic views of history, politics, and literature. The services of these writers have been very great. They restored the balance, which was leaning terribly against religion, both in politics and letters. They created a Catholic opinion and a great Catholic literature, and they conquered for the Church a very powerful influence in European thought. The word "ultramontane" was revived to designate this school, and that restricted term was made to embrace men as different as De Maistre and Bonald, Lamennais and Montalembert, Balmez and Donoso Cortes, Stolberg and Schlegel, Phillips and Tapparelli.

There are two peculiarities by which we may test this

whole group of eminent writers: their identification of Catholicism with some secular cause, such as the interests of a particular political or philosophical system, and the use they make of Protestant authorities. The views which they endeavoured to identify with the cause of the Church, however various, agreed in giving them the air of partisans. Like advocates, they were wont to defend their cause with the ingenuity of those who know that all points are not equally strong, and that nothing can be conceded except what they can defend. They did much for the cause of learning, though they took little interest in what did not immediately serve their turn. In their use of Protestant writers they displayed the same partiality. They estimated a religious adversary, not by his knowledge, but by his concessions; and they took advantage of the progress of historical criticism, not to revise their opinions, but to obtain testimony to their truth. It was characteristic of the school to be eager in citing the favourable passages from Protestant authors, and to be careless of those which were less serviceable for discussion. In the principal writers this tendency was counteracted by character and learning; but in the hands of men less competent or less suspicious of themselves, sore pressed by the necessities of controversy, and too obscure to challenge critical correction, the method became a snare for both the writer and his readers. Thus the very qualities which we condemn in our opponents, as the natural defences of error, and the significant emblems of a bad cause, came to taint both our literature and our policy.

Learning has passed on beyond the range of these men's vision. Their greatest strength was in the weakness of their adversaries, and their own faults were eclipsed by the monstrous errors against which they fought. But scientific methods have now been so perfected, and have come to be applied in so cautious and so fair a spirit, that the apologists of the last generation have collapsed before them. Investigations have become so impersonal, so colourless, so free from the prepossessions which distort truth, from predetermined aims and foregone conclusions, that their results can only be met by investigations in which the same methods are yet more completely and conscientiously applied. The sounder scholar is invincible by the brilliant rhetorician; and the eloquence and ingenuity of De Maistre and Schlegel would be of no avail against researches pursued with perfect mastery of science and singleness of purpose. The apologist's armour would be vulnerable at the point where his religion and his science were forced into artificial union.



Again, as science widens and deepens, it escapes from the grasp of dilettantism. Such knowledge as existed formerly could be borrowed, or superficially acquired, by men whose lives were not devoted to its pursuit; and subjects as far apart as the controversies of Scripture, history, and physical science, might be respectably discussed by a single writer. No such shallow versatility is possible now. The new accuracy and certainty of criticism have made science unattainable except by those who devote themselves systematically to its study. The training of a skilled labourer has become indispensable for the scholar, and science yields its results to none but those who have mastered its methods.

Herein consists the distinction between the apologists we have described and that school of writers and thinkers which is now growing up in foreign countries, and on the triumph of which the position of the Church in modern society depends. While she was surrounded with men whose learning was sold to the service of untruth, her defenders naturally adopted the artifices of the advocate, and wrote as if they were pleading for a human cause. It was their concern only to promote those precise kinds and portions of knowledge which would confound an adversary, or support a claim. But learning ceased to be hostile to Christianity when it ceased to be pursued merely as an instrument of controversy—when facts came to be acknowledged, no longer because they were useful, but simply because they were true. Religion had no occasion to rectify the results of learning when irreligion had ceased to pervert them, and the old weapons of controversy became repulsive as soon as they had ceased to be useful.

By this means the authority of political right and of scientific truth has been reestablished, and they have become, not tools to be used by religion for her own interests, but conditions which she must observe in her actions and arguments. Within their respective spheres, politics can determine what rights are just, science what truths are certain. There are few political or scientific problems which affect the doctrines of religion, and none of them are hostile to it in their solution. But this is not the difficulty which is usually felt. A political principle or a scientific discovery is more commonly judged, not by its relation to religious truth, but by its bearings on some manifest or probable religious interest. A fact may be true, or a law may be just, and yet it may, under certain conditions, involve some spiritual loss.

And here is the touchstone and the watershed of principles. Some men argue, that the object of government is to contribute to the salvation of souls; that certain measures may imperil this end, and that therefore they must be condemned. These men only look to interests; they cannot conceive the duty of sacrificing them to independent political principle or idea. Or, again, they will say, "Here is a scientific discovery calculated to overthrow many traditionary ideas, to undo a prevailing system of theology, to disprove a current interpretation, to cast discredit on eminent authorities, to compel men to revise their most settled opinions, to disturb the foundation on which the faith of others stands." These are sufficient reasons for care in the dispensation of truth; but the men we are describing will go on to say, "This is enough to throw suspicion on the discovery itself; even if it is true, its danger is greater than its value. Let it therefore be carefully buried, and let all traces of it be swept away."

A policy like this appears to us both wrong in itself and derogatory to the cause it is employed to serve. It argues either a timid faith which fears the light, or a false morality which would do evil that good might come. How often have Catholics involved themselves in hopeless contradiction, sacrificed principle to opportunity, adapted their theories to their interests, and staggered the world's reliance on their sincerity by subterfuges which entangle the Church in the shifting sands of party warfare, instead of establishing her cause on the solid rock of principles! How often have they clung to some plausible chimera which seemed to serve their cause, and nursed an artificial ignorance where they feared the discoveries of an impertinent curiosity! As ingenious in detraction as in silence and dissimulation, have they not too often answered imputations which they could not disprove with accusations which they could not prove, till the slanders they had invented rivalled in number and intensity the slanders which had been invented against them? For such men principles have had only temporary value and local currency. Whatever force was the strongest in any place and at any time, with that they have sought to ally the cause of religion. They have, with equal zeal, identified her with freedom in one country, and with absolutism in another; with conservatism where she had privileges to keep, and with reform where she had oppression to withstand. And for all this, what have they gained? They have betrayed duties more sacred than the privileges for which they fought; they have lied before God and



man; they have been divided into factions by the supposed interests of the Church, when they ought to have been united by her principles and her doctrines; and against themselves they have justified those grave accusations of falsehood, insincerity, indifference to civil rights, and contempt for civil authorities, which are uttered with such profound injustice against the Church.

The present difficulties of the Church,—her internal dissensions and apparent weakness, the alienation of so much intellect, the strong prejudice which keeps many away from her altogether, and makes many who had approached her shrink back,—all draw nourishment from this rank soil. The antagonism of hostile doctrines, and the enmity of governments, count for little in comparison. It is in vain to point to her apostolic tradition, the unbroken unity of her doctrine, her missionary energy, or her triumphs in the region of spiritual life, if we fail to remove the accumulated prejudice which generations of her advocates have thrown up around her. The world can never know and recognise her divine perfection while the pleas of her defenders are scarcely nearer to the truth than the crimes which her enemies impute to her. How can the stranger understand, where the children of the kingdom are deceived?

Against this policy a firm and unyielding stand is of supreme necessity. The evil is curable and the loss recoverable by a conscientious adherence to higher principles, and a patient pursuit of truth and right. Political science can place the liberty of the Church on principles so certain and unfailing, that intelligent and disinterested Protestants will accept them; and in every branch of learning with which religion is in any way connected, the progressive discovery of truth will strengthen faith by promoting knowledge and correcting opinion, while it destroys prejudices and superstitions by dissipating the errors on which they are founded. This is a course which conscience must approve in the whole, though against each particular step of it conscience may itself be tempted to revolt. It does not always conduce to immediate advantage; it may lead across dangerous and scandalous ground. A rightful sovereign may exclude the Church from his dominions, or persecute her members. Is she therefore to say that his right is no right, or that all intolerance is necessarily wrong? A newly discovered truth may be a stumbling-block to perplex or to alienate the minds of men. Is she therefore to deny or smother it? By no means. She must in every case do right. She must prefer the law of her own general spirit

to the exigencies of immediate external occasion, and leave the issue in the hands of God.

Such is the substance of those principles which shut out *The Home and Foreign Review* from the sympathies of a large portion of the body to which we belong. In common with no small or insignificant section of our fellow Catholics, we hold that the time has gone by when defects in political or scientific education could be alleged as an excuse for depending upon expediency or mistrusting knowledge; and that the moment has come when the best service that can be done to religion is to be faithful to principle, to uphold the right in politics though it should require an apparent sacrifice, and to seek truth in science though it should involve a possible risk. Modern society has developed no security for freedom, no instrument of progress, no means of arriving at truth, which we look upon with indifference or suspicion. We see no necessary gulf to separate our political or scientific convictions from those of the wisest and most intelligent men who may differ from us in religion. In pursuing those studies in which they can sympathise, starting from principles which they can accept, and using methods which are theirs as well as ours, we shall best attain the objects which alone can be aimed at in a Review,—our own instruction, and the conciliation of opponents.

There are two main considerations by which it is necessary that we should be guided in our pursuit of these objects. First, we have to remember that the scientific method is most clearly exhibited and recognised in connection with subjects about which there are no prepossessions to wound, no fears to excite, no interests to threaten. Hence, not only do we exclude from our range all that concerns the ascetic life and the more intimate relations of religion, but we most willingly devote ourselves to the treatment of subjects quite remote from all religious bearing. Secondly, we have to remember that the internal government of the Church belongs to a sphere exclusively ecclesiastical, from the discussion of which we are shut out, not only by motives of propriety and reverence, but also by the necessary absence of any means for forming a judgment. So much ground is fenced off by these two considerations, that a secular sphere alone remains. The character of a scientific Review is determined for it. It cannot enter on the domains of ecclesiastical government or of faith; and neither of them can possibly be affected by its conclusions or its mode of discussion.

In asserting thus absolutely that all truth must render service to religion, we are saying what few perhaps will



deny in the abstract, but what many are not prepared to admit in detail. It will be vaguely felt, that views which take so little account of present inconvenience and manifest danger are perilous and novel, though they may seem to spring from a more unquestioning faith, a more absolute confidence in truth, and a more perfect submission to the general laws of morality. There is no articulate theory, and no distinct view, but there is long habit, and there are strong inducements of another kind, which support this sentiment.

To understand the certainty of scientific truth, a man must have deeply studied scientific method; to understand the obligation of political principle requires a similar mental discipline. A man who is suddenly introduced from without into a society where this certainty and obligation are currently acknowledged, is naturally bewildered. He cannot distinguish between the dubious impressions of his second-hand knowledge, and the certainty of that primary direct information which those who possess it have no power to deny. To accept a criterion which may condemn some cherished opinion has hitherto seemed to him a mean surrender, and a sacrifice of position. He feels it simple loss to give up an idea; and even if he is prepared to surrender it when compelled by controversy, still he thinks it quite unnecessary and gratuitous to engage voluntarily in researches which may lead to such an issue. To enter thus upon the discussion of questions which have been mixed up with religion, and made to contribute their support to piety, seems to the idle spectator, or to the person who is absorbed in defending religion, a mere useless and troublesome meddling, dictated by the pride of intellectual triumph, or by the moral cowardice which seeks unworthily to propitiate enemies.

Great consideration is due to those whose minds are not prepared for the full light of truth and the grave responsibilities of knowledge; who have not learned to distinguish what is divine from what is human—defined dogma from the atmosphere of opinion which surrounds it,—and who honour both with the same awful reverence. Great allowances are also due to those who are constantly labouring to nourish the spark of belief in minds perplexed by difficulties, or darkened by ignorance and prejudice. These men have not always the results of research at command; they have no time to keep abreast with the constant progress of historical and critical science; and the solutions which they are obliged to give are consequently often imperfect, and

adapted only to uninstructed and uncultivated minds. Their reasoning cannot be the same as that of the scholar who has to meet error in its most vigorous, refined, and ingenious form. As knowledge advances, it must inevitably happen that they will find some of their hitherto accepted facts contradicted, and some arguments overturned which have done good service. They will find that some statements, which they have adopted under stress of controversy, to remove prejudice and doubt, turn out to be hasty and partial replies to the questions they were meant to answer, and that the true solutions would require more copious explanation than they can give. And thus will be brought home to their minds, that, in the topics upon which popular controversy chiefly turns, the conditions of discussion and the resources of argument are subject to gradual and constant change.

A Review, therefore, which undertakes to investigate political and scientific problems, without any direct subservience to the interests of a party or a cause, but with the belief that such investigation, by its very independence and straightforwardness, must give the most valuable indirect assistance to religion, cannot expect to enjoy at once the favour of those who have grown up in another school of ideas. Men who are occupied in the special functions of ecclesiastical life, where the Church is all-sufficient and requires no extraneous aid, will naturally see at first in the problems of public life, the demands of modern society, and the progress of human learning, nothing but new and unwelcome difficulties,—trial and distraction to themselves, temptation and danger to their flocks. In time, they will learn that there is a higher and a nobler course for Catholics than one which begins in fear and does not lead to security. They will come to see how vast a service they may render to the Church by vindicating for themselves a place in every movement that promotes the study of God's works and the advancement of mankind. They will remember that, while the office of ecclesiastical authority is to tolerate, to warn, and to guide, that of religious intelligence and zeal is not to leave the great work of intellectual and social civilisation to be the monopoly and privilege of others, but to save it from debasement by giving to it for leaders the children, not the enemies, of the Church. And at length, in the progress of political right and scientific knowledge, in the development of freedom in the State and of truth in literature, they will recognise one of the first among their human duties and the highest of their earthly rewards.



CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

1. *The Theætetus of Plato*, with a revised text and English notes. By the Rev. Lewis Campbell, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Oxford. (Oxford, at the University Press.)
2. *Callimachi Cyrenensis Hymni et Epigrammata*. Edidit Augustus Meineke. (Berlin.)
3. *Juvenalis Satiræ XVI*. With English notes, by Herman Prior, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford. Expurgated edition. (London : Whittaker and Bell.)
4. *Das Leben der Griechen und Römer nach antiken Bildwerken dargestellt* von Ernst Guhl und Wilh. Koner. (Berlin : Weidmann.)
5. *Geschichte des Griechischen Schauspiels vom Standpunkt der dramatischen Kunst*. Von Moriz Rapp. (Tübingen.)
6. *L'Histoire Romaine à Rome*, par J. J. Ampère. (Paris.)
7. *The New Testament, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek Text*. By F. P. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore. (Baltimore : Kelly, Hedian, and Piet.)
8. *Die Kalendarien und Martyrologien der Angelsachsen, so wie das Martyrologium und der Computus der Herrad von Landsperg, nebst Annalen der Jahre 1859 und 1860*. Von Ferdinand Piper, Doctor und Professor der Theologie an der Universität zu Berlin. (Berlin : R. Decker.)
9. *Fabric Rolls and Documents of York Minster ; or, a Defence of "The History of the Metropolitan Church of St. Peter, York."* Addressed to the President of the Surtees Society. By John Browne. (York.)
10. *Histoire des Ducs et des Comtes de Champagne*. Par H. d'Arbois de Jubainville. Vol. III. (Paris : Durand.)
11. *Commentaires de Charles Quint*. Publiés pour la première fois par le Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove. (Bruxelles : Heussner.)
12. *La Littérature indépendante et les Ecrivains oubliés*. Par Victor Fournel. (Paris : Didier.)
13. *Œuvres de Leibniz*. Publiées par A. Foucher de Careil. Vol. IV. (Paris : Didot.)
14. *Saint-Martin. Le Philosophe inconnu*. Par M. Matter. (Paris : Didier.)
15. *Histoire de la Terreur, 1792-1794*. Par M. Mortimer-Ternaux. Vol. II. (Paris : Michel Lévy.)
16. *Mémoires sur Carnot*. Par son Fils. Vol. I. (Paris : Pagnerre.)
17. *Mémoires de M. Dupin*. Vol. IV. (Paris : Henri Plon.)

18. *Œuvres choisies de Pierre Tchadaïef*. Publiées pour la première fois par le P. Gagarin, S.J. (Leipzig and Paris: Franck.)
19. *Frederick Lucas. A Biography*. By C. J. Riethmüller. (London: Bell and Daldy.)
20. *Unto this Last*. Four Essays on the First Principles of Political Economy. By John Ruskin. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co.)
21. *Robert O'Hara Burke, and the Australian Exploring Expedition of 1860*. By Andrew Jackson. (London: Smith, Elder & Co.)
22. *Protestantism and Infidelity. An Appeal to candid Americans*. By F. X. Weninger, D.D., S.J. (New York: Sadlier and Co.)
23. *Literarischer Handweiser für das Katholische Deutschland*. Herausgegeben von Franz Hülskamp und Hermann Rump. 7 Nos. (Munster: Theissing.)

1. It is a just remark, that the literary productions of the two English Universities bear a very small proportion to the number of those emanating from scholars of continental places of education; and that as in quantity they are few, so even in quality they do not very often rise above the level of a respectable mediocrity in European literature. At Oxford, indeed, for some years past there has been almost a complete stagnation either of literary talent or literary energy, or both. In the classical and scientific departments, next to nothing has been done; in the philosophical and historic, perhaps a little, yet only a little, more. And what we have to regret especially is that that little so seldom rises to first-rate excellence. We have hopes, however, that Mr. Campbell's *Theætetus*, though rather pertaining to the philosophical than to the purely classical branch, will do something to gain Oxford credit even with our more learned neighbours in Germany.

Mr. Campbell shows, in a long and very carefully written preface of nearly a hundred pages, that he has studied deeply, and in the minutest points, the various schools and phases of the early Greek philosophy. He has not, however, learnt the art, we will not say of *popularising* it,—for such a subject can hardly be brought down quite to the level of ordinary minds,—but of putting it in its fairest, most lucid, or at all events least repulsive form. To confess the truth, it would be difficult to conceive more *heavy* reading than the whole of this preface, which to a considerable extent is a general sketch of ancient philosophy, and the bearings of the Platonic system upon it. The *Theætetus* itself is, undoubtedly, very difficult; but it is always fascinating from the earnestness of the argument, the dramatic management of the discussions, and, above all, from its inimitable language. On the whole, the *Theætetus* of Plato must be pronounced one of the very greatest works the human mind ever produced. Its subject is, *What is science?* (ἐπιστήμη, or exact knowledge.) It is the object of Socrates to discuss various theories respecting it; to show the fallacy of all; and at the end to leave the question just as undecided as it was at first. It is only another form



of the old question,—and one which we know to have presented itself to many earnest inquirers in those seats of ancient learning,—“What is truth?” But the processes by which Socrates is made to set aside as futile one theory after another,—to show that knowledge is not sensation, nor what each man thinks to be true for himself, nor right opinion, nor right opinion joined with λόγος, *i. e.* the faculty of accounting for and maintaining it,—are really most ingenious pieces of reasoning. Call them technical logic, or cavilling, or even quibbling, or what you please, they invariably carry the reader with them, like the eloquence of a consummate pleader in court.

“The turning-point of the whole dialogue,” says Mr. Campbell (Preface, p. xiii.), “the fulcrum, by means of which the mind is finally lifted out of the region of sense, is the mention of the good, expedient, just, and honourable, which Theætetus had at first unwarily included amongst the things which are not, but become. The knowledge of what is good cannot be resolved into sensation, nor into those motions on which the doctrine of sense was founded, because it regards the future. This thought is also the occasion of the eloquent digression in which a just and holy life, accompanied with wisdom (*μετὰ φρονήσεως*), is set forth as the way from earth to heaven. And the form in which this idea of good occurs is not transcendent, as in the Republic; nor, as in the Philebus, arrived at by a process of reasoning upon the combination of finite and infinite in the world. It is more simple and Socratic than in either of these. And while it is conceived of as one, Socrates is not afraid of varying the name (*ἀγαθόν, καλόν, ὠφέλιμον, δίκαιον, ὅσιον, φρόνησις*).”

Mr. Campbell enters at length into the question, how far Plato (or Socrates) was indebted, in the subject-matter of the *Theætetus*, to the doctrines of Heraclitus, to whom he attributes a large share; or to those of Parmenides, of Protagorás, and of Gorgias. He holds that Plato was rather the exponent of and disputant on the various philosophical theories of his day, than the inventor of any one definite or consistent scheme or view. “It becomes apparent” (he says, p. lxiii.), “on a wider survey, that more varieties of thought existed around Plato than we have names for, or than can be easily summed up in one or two formulæ. And at every step we become more convinced that no limit can be assigned to his fertility either of imagination or thought. Such a comparison is the natural and necessary test of every hypothesis regarding any single dialogue.”

Again (p. xv.), “Plato is himself continually holding converse with some one, and dramatic propriety is preserved, not only in minute points, but in the tone pervading whole dialogues. Even amongst those in which Socrates holds the first place, a marked difference is perceivable; which may be accounted for by saying, (1) that Socrates is not Socrates, but Plato becoming all things to all philosophies; (2) that Socrates is not altogether Plato, but a part representation, part creation of Plato’s, which he contemplates and converses with, and even criticises; (3) that Socrates himself has different faces, reflected partially in his different followers, the most

characteristic of which, the negative 'elenchus,' was reflected in Euclides of Megara."

As a commentator, Mr. Campbell is useful, we think, more as a philosopher and a logician than as a grammarian. Indeed, it is the tendency of the Oxford school to make this last of secondary, as Cambridge scholars always make it of primary importance. We do not mean, however, that Mr. Campbell shows himself seriously at fault even in this department; and in that of criticism and selection of Ms. readings he is every where most careful. We notice here and there a little tendency to a lax rendering, *e. g.* p. 174 (margin), πολὺ βδάλλοντα is not merely 'being rich in milk,' but 'sucking out much milk;' the allusion being to the practice of herdsmen to suck cows' udders like a leech (βδέλλα). So in p. 175, πάλιν αὖ τὰ ἀντίστροφα ἀποδίδωσιν is not 'he gives the philosopher his revenge,' but 'again he in turn exhibits the exact counterpart of the other.' It is impossible that προσανατρίψασθαι (p. 169) should mean 'to give a grip,' or 'try one fall' with a person. It seems to have signified 'to rub oil on the body in preparing to wrestle with another.' Nor is κυλινδεῖσθαι ἐν δικαστηρίοις, 'to be jostled' in law-courts, but is a metaphor derived from animals which frequent and wallow in certain favourite spots. A few such laxities of translation (for we will not call them inaccuracies, where the general sense is rightly given) form no serious detracting of merit from a very excellent book. For deep students of Plato, this edition of *Theætetus* will be almost a necessity; for mere beginners Mr. Campbell probably did not condescend to write. For this reason we have some fears that his work will hardly become extensively popular in this country.

2. In addition to Aristophanes, published by the same editor in 1860, Theocritus in 1856, and other works which have already won for the distinguished annotator on the *Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets* a very high rank among the greatest scholars of the day, we have now from him another most welcome contribution to classical literature,—a good and readable edition of Callimachus. Though but little studied, perhaps, in this country, Callimachus is a poet of surpassing beauty and interest. His writings are difficult, often extremely so; for he treats largely of mythological subjects, of which we have rather scanty information from other sources. The remains, indeed, which we possess of this author are not extensive. They consist of Hymns, severally addressed to Zeus, to Apollo, to Artemis, to Demeter; one on the isle of Delos; an elegiac poem on the "Bath of Pallas;" and about seventy epigrams. The whole contain about twelve hundred verses—a small quantity compared with the forty-eight books of Homer, yet comprising much matter that none but very able scholars can satisfactorily elucidate. Callimachus of Cyrene, in Africa, was one of the so-called Alexandrian school, of which Theocritus, Apollonius Rhodius, Aratus, and Lycophron are well-known and justly-celebrated poets. Living under



the patronage of the Ptolemies, and residing at Alexandria, among literary men and grammarians, and in some cases personally connected with the immense Alexandrian library (of which Callimachus was librarian about B.C. 250), they created a distinct order of poetry, founded indeed on the old epic school, but distinguished by the use of many words and inflexions of their own age and dialect. Very interesting and often highly pathetic as are the hymns of Callimachus, they have never been critically edited in England except by Dr. Blomfield, the late Bishop of London; and of his critical labours on this author Meineke speaks rather disparagingly. "Blomfieldius quam imparem se difficili labori ostenderit, non attinet in re omnibus nota explanare copiosius," he says in commencing his preface. Few Mss., and none of great antiquity, are known to exist of Callimachus, whose works were first published by Lascaris, at Florence, as early as 1494.

Besides a critical commentary at the foot of each page, and occasional, but too scanty, extracts from the Scholia, Meineke has added a valuable, though rather discursive, *diatribe* or commentary at the end. Here he expatiates with very great learning, and with a display of reading which is peculiarly German, on the more difficult questions of mythology and geography, and on some proposed critical emendations. On the whole, considering that Meineke undoubtedly belongs to the school of rather violent emendators, we think he has shown reasonable moderation and good sense in this respect. Once or twice, indeed, he has gone beyond the bounds of probability, as we think. For instance, in the Hymn to Demeter, v. 107, where the malady of ravenous hunger sent by the goddess on one who had offended her is described, the poet says that all the provisions in the house were eaten up, and the cooks declared they could supply no more:

ἤδη γὰρ ἀπηνήσαντο μάγειροι.

There is nothing very difficult in this sense of ἀπαρνέσθαι, 'to refuse;' but Meineke introduces a form which has no existence in Greek literature, but which he calls "perquam probabile," viz. ἀπηναρίσαντο, from ἀπεναρίζειν, and interprets *jam enim stabula spoliarent* (he should have said *spoliarent*) *armentis*. In the Hymn to Artemis, v. 36, where Zeus is made to say to his daughter, that he will allot to her thirty cities devoted especially to her worship, the poet adds,

πολλὰς δὲ ξυνηΐας διαμετρήσασθαι.

Here Meineke reads on his own conjecture διαμοιρήσασθαι, but proposes in the *Diatribe* the further change Δι' μοιρήσασθαι. We think the context clearly requires διαμετρήσονται, 'men shall lay out (*i. e.* plan, or found) many cities devoted in common to your worship.' This use of διαμετρεῖσθαι occurs also in the Hymn to Apollo, v. 55. In v. 66, we think the editor has wrongly altered ἀπειθέα into ἀπεχθέα; for ἀπειθέα τεύχειν, in a poet like Callimachus, may very well mean, what the sense requires, 'to act disobediently.' Again,

in the Hymn to Delos, v. 249, we think he is wrong in introducing ἄοχοι, 'servants,' for ἀοιδοὶ, 'songsters' (where the poet is speaking of the swans on the crater-lake at Delos), and in giving μέλλοντες for μέλποντες. We should rather read,

κύκνοι δὲ θεὸν μέλποντες ἀοιδοὶ,

where θεὸν for θεοῦ is an obvious conjecture. The sense is, that the swans, as they flew from the Pactolus in Asia Minor, sang the praises of the god of Delos. Meineke's objection is weak: "cum Apollo nondum editus sit in lucem, quo tandem pacto cygni deum canere dici possunt?" Of course, the poet attributed to the bird of song (as the ancients thought the swan) a presentiment in coming over for that purpose to Delos. In the same hymn, v. 268, we think the old reading αὐτῇ, *sola*, much better than the emendation αὐτάρ. But in v. 11, we doubt not ἄπρυγος, 'without vineyards,' is a successful emendation of ἄτροπος; this absence of the grape being specially predicated of Delos in the Homeric hymn to Apollo, v. 55:

οὐδὲ τρύγην οἴσεις, οὔτ' ἄρ φυτὰ μυρία φύσεις.

Similarly in v. 268, already alluded to, the island itself says,

αὐτὴ ἐγὼ τοιῆδε δυσήροτος.

The majority of emendations, however, at least of the more violent kind, are reserved for the *Diatrise*, as they should be, and are not obtruded on the reader by being inserted in the text. On the whole, this is a most excellent and satisfactory edition of Callimachus, and we have experienced the greatest pleasure in reading it.

3. This forms a cheap, very useful, and judiciously edited volume of that excellent series, the "Grammar-School Classics." Juvenal, in spite of the questionable character of some few of his Satires, is, and doubtless will be, extensively read in schools and colleges; and we can only neutralise the moral harm (which to a certain extent does exist, as a set-off to the educational good) by providing editions like the present, where every thing really coarse is expunged, while a brief but sufficient commentary is supplied at the foot of each page, passing over lightly what least bears to be dwelt upon, and explaining more fully such matters as pertain rather to history, archæology, or the ordinary habits of domestic Roman life. Indeed, without Juvenal and Martial, who were contemporaries under the Emperor Domitian, we should know comparatively little of the more minute details of the daily life of that wonderful people at, perhaps, the most interesting period. What Aristophanes is to the Greek, that Juvenal, Persius, and Martial are to Roman manners. If, therefore, Greek and Roman literature is worth understanding at all, these poets must be read. And it is very possible, as this volume shows, to present them to the young mind in a form nearly, if not wholly, unobjectionable.

In this edition, the larger portion of the sixth Satire (which is usually omitted wholly, as unreadable) is inserted, and commented



on in a manner which ought to satisfy the most fastidious. By adopting the plan of making the author, as far as possible, illustrate himself, and so by adding references only where other editors give tedious notes, and by the happy adoption of a very terse style, Mr. Prior has accomplished the creditable feat of giving nearly all the sixteen Satires, with sufficient English notes, in the narrow limit of 220 duodecimo pages. On the whole, the work is excellently adapted for school use.

We take this opportunity of recommending a cheap, accurate, and beautifully printed duodecimo series of the Classics, both Greek and Latin, called the *Cambridge Greek and Latin Texts*. Printed at the University Press, and in all cases having undergone a most careful revision, they are models of clear and elegant typography, as well as trustworthy editions for the lecture-room. Being only texts, they call for no especial criticism. One of the most valuable of the Latin series is a thoroughly revised text of that difficult, but most interesting poet, Lucretius. It is edited (with a few brief critical notes, forming an introduction) by one of our first Latin scholars, Mr. Munro, Fellow of Trinity College.

4. The recent work of HH. Guhl and Koner on the external life of the Greeks and Romans appears to be of great value, especially from the educational point of view; and we do not know that we could refer the English student to any precisely similar work in his own language. The authors state in their introduction, that while much has been done of late years to elicit the fundamental principles, natural, moral, and intellectual, on which the greatness of the Greek and Roman nations was built up, there seemed to be a want of some collective summing up of the results of those modern inquiries, the aim of which is to gain a clear knowledge of the *external* life of antiquity. This work had been projected by the bookseller Karl Reimer; and after his premature death,—since no single scholar could be easily found capable of coping adequately with so vast a subject,—the present authors agreed to divide the work between them, Herr Guhl undertaking the architectural department, Herr Koner that of furniture, dress, manners, and the incidents of private life generally. The object of the entire work they state to be, to make this side of the life of classical times accessible to wider circles, and so “to pave the way for a juster appreciation of the ideas on which the eternal significance of classical antiquity depends.” The result of their labours is the work before us, which, in two clearly printed volumes of moderate size and extremely moderate cost, illustrated by more than eight hundred woodcuts executed in a good and clear style of wood-engraving, contains an amount of information which the English university student would have to search for, and perhaps sometimes in vain, through a score of unconnected and expensive books. The only work we have which can be in any way compared with it, Dr. Smith’s *Dictionary of Antiquities*, attempts too much; it embraces the political systems and laws, as

well as the external life, of the Greeks and Romans, and consequently treats the latter subject in a meagre and unsatisfactory manner.

The arrangement of HH. Guhl and Koner's book is simple. In the first volume the various classes of Grecian buildings are first examined,—those dedicated to the gods, public constructions, private dwellings, and sepulchres; then Grecian furniture, domestic utensils, and dress, the manners and habits of women, marriage, education, music, armour, navigation, meals, dancing, sacrifices, and funeral rites. In the second, or Roman volume, the same order is observed. A good English translation of this book would be exceedingly useful.

5. The new work by Herr Rapp on the Grecian drama scarcely fulfils the expectations raised by the title-page and introduction. His theory of the right mode of treatment in criticising the masterpieces of the Greek stage is striking, and perhaps rational; but there is a want of power in its adaptation. The theory itself is not quite original, but an application of the Hegelian philosophy to this special field. In noticing the progress of dramatic criticism among the Germans, the author justly names Lessing as their first great critic; but Lessing, he says, until a late period of his life, was prepossessed in favour of the French classical drama, and the principles on which it was founded. His chief critical efforts indicate this bias of his feelings; and when at last he came to understand and reverence the surpassing greatness of Shakespeare, his vital energies no longer sufficed to enable him to elaborate a fresh theory. After Lessing, Herr Rapp proceeds to speak of A. W. Schlegel's well-known work, and of the acceptance which it has met with in all lands; still he maintains that Schlegel's point of view is philological merely, and that he never gets beyond the fundamental assumption of classical and French culture. But Germany resolved to fathom the problem of art more deeply. Kant's *Kritik* was the starting-point of a new direction given to æsthetical criticism; Schiller and Schelling followed in the same track; and finally, in the profound lectures of Hegel, a German doctrine of art was established on a philosophical basis. This doctrine, to which our author adheres, regards the history of dramatic poetry as a section of universal history, like which it is conditioned by laws of necessary evolution, so that the dramatic art which is naturally correlated to one stage of human culture necessarily differs from that so correlated to a later stage. Hence it is absurd to endeavour to reproduce the classical stage in modern times; and hence again it follows that the Spanish and English dramas, which arose spontaneously out of the circumstances of their own times, are classical for those times, and represent a more advanced and developed state of dramatic art than the plays of the Greek tragedians. For the Germans, the author continues, the English stage is the pattern and foundation of all their own efforts; the German stage can only count for a continuation of the English. On this theory, the ancient drama must submit to be judged, not by the canons of Aristotelian, but by those of modern criticism, which are more perfect than



the former, simply because they correspond to a more advanced stage of human culture. Accordingly, our author proceeds to examine the works of the Greek dramatists *seriatim*, describing the plot of each of the seventy plays now extant (including those by Terence and Plautus which represent Greek originals), as well as of the ten tragedies of Seneca, and adding in each case a few critical remarks. The descriptions are good, but the criticism, so far as we have examined it, seems feeble enough;—a pointless and unsatisfactory comparison of the *Œdipus Tyrannus* to Shakespeare's *Macbeth* may be taken as a sample of it. The dramatic criticism in Müller's *History of Greek Literature*, continued by Donaldson, is of far greater value, and goes over nearly the same ground.

6. It may be doubted whether M. Ampère, with all his ingenuity and power of picturesque description, has given a sufficient reason for the production of his *Histoire Romaine à Rome*. The great advantage which he attributes to the circumstance of writing the history on the spot is, that "the imagination, excited by the actual sight of the localities, aids the intelligence; what one sees helps one to discover what one does not see; and from a soil long contemplated with the emotion and curiosity which it inspires come forth unhopèd-for teachings." These teachings, however, are not implicitly to be depended upon; they are oftener sentimental than scientific; and if not carefully corrected and checked by other sources of information, they will as often mislead as aid the intelligence. We do not think M. Ampère has sufficiently attended to this. Here, after the labours of Niebuhr, Mommsen, Schwegler, and Lewis, we have a grave attempt to reconstruct the pre-Romulean annals of the city; and the first volume of the newest history of Rome brings us, at the end of five hundred pages, to the reign of Tullus Hostilius! M. Ampère is inclined to admit as historical the whole of the common account of Romulus and of the kings generally, except the supernatural portions of it. What interest, he says, could the Romans have had in supposing that their first founders were the brigands and escaped criminals of the Asylum? To this one may answer, that the respectability of such an origin must be measured by their ideas rather than ours. Moreover, there is a vanity in the intentional depreciation of one's antecedents, as well as in boasting and exaggeration; and a proud people, conscious of its present strength, might have gloried in pointing to its supposed lowly origin. There are families in Jamaica who feel no shame in tracing their descent from the Buccaneers; nor is it uncommon to find a parvenu who boasts of having entered London or Manchester without a penny in his pocket. But at any rate, whether probable or not, the story of Romulus wants evidence, and, in default of such evidence, cannot be received as history. No one says that it could not possibly have been true; but the nature of the evidence is not such as to raise even a feeble presumption of its truth. For the earliest Roman annalists lived 470 years after the date assigned to Romulus; and

our accumulated critical experience assures us that oral tradition cannot be trusted to convey a reliable record of events across a period so vast. The historical existence even of Hengist and Horsa is now considered doubtful, although the gap which separates them from the earliest Anglo-Saxon writer is far less considerable. In that part of his argument which is founded on the monuments, M. Ampère seems to forget that the belief in a story may give rise to monuments in which that belief finds external expression; and that an old name, the true origin of which has been forgotten, has often been brought into connection with a popular story for the sake of giving it a satisfactory explanation. A picture of Hengist, dating from the twelfth century, would not prove his real existence. Another argument rests on the primitive poetry of Rome,—the heroic ballads. Schwegler has thrown doubt upon the existence of any such ballads; but granting that they did exist, and that the earliest historians used them as materials, and that they did record some real occurrences, the difficulty still remains that we have no means of distinguishing what was true in them from what was false. It is probable that many actual occurrences are referred to by Homer; but it is utterly impossible for us to disentangle them from the mass of fiction in which they are embedded.

In M. Ampère's second volume the narrative proceeds more rapidly than in the first, and comes down to the period of the Licinian Rogations, B.C. 368. His perfect acquaintance with the topography enables him to describe the restless internal life of the Roman population, perpetually agitated by the passions of conflicting classes, with a vividness and local colour which we miss in ordinary historians.

7. Archbishop Kenrick's translation of the New Testament appears for the second time after an interval of eleven years, during which he has completed a translation of the whole Bible. It contains valuable notes for popular use, and is remarkable as the most complete revision of the Rheims version that has yet been made. The great learning of the author, and the approbation of his labour by the Ninth Synod of Baltimore, confer on this work an authority which is not possessed by any of the recent translations into other languages. Of these the most important is the German translation by Dr. Reischl of Ratisbon, who seems to have been guided by principles nearly the same as those of the Archbishop. Although Dr. Kenrick in his preface describes his work as a revision of the Rheims Testament, he has in fact allowed himself considerable latitude for alteration and improvement; whilst the German translator proceeds without any reference whatever to the modern translations. Except so far as he is influenced by the Rheims version, Dr. Kenrick evidently occupies towards the Vulgate the same position as Dr. Reischl. The peculiar difficulty of the Vulgate translation arises from the closeness with which it endeavours to follow the text, and even the style, of the original. It is not always free from ambiguity, unless it is



compared with the Hebrew or the Greek. The Latin of the Vulgate, as the basis of a translation, requires therefore to be illustrated by the original from which it is taken. Latin philology alone would be constantly misled by passages which sacrifice idiomatic Latinity to literalism. A mere Latin scholar translating the Vulgate would produce a version in which it would be often impossible to recognise the sense of the original, and the meaning of St. Jerome. The German translator goes farther than this consideration alone would warrant in questioning the authority of the Vulgate. The German language, he very justly says, is, from its copiousness and flexibility, far more capable of adapting itself to the sense of the ancient texts than the Latin. When, therefore, the Vulgate and the Greek do not correspond, he considers it sometimes due to the poverty of the Latin tongue, and abandons the Vulgate to follow the original.

Dr. Kenrick has endeavoured by this translation to satisfy the desire expressed by the Synod of Baltimore of a version for general use,—*conficiatur versio quæ in communem usum deducatur*. His notes are of a practical character, which does not require a display of recondite learning. We will give an instance which is interesting in connection with the strong language of the Archbishop of New York against the seceding slave-owners. The verse 1 Cor. viii. 21, "Wast thou called, being a bondman? care not: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather;" is quoted by Abolitionists as an argument against the lawfulness of slavery. The Archbishop of Baltimore adopts St. John Chrysostom's interpretation, that slavery is morally a benefit rather than a detriment, and thus proves the impossibility for Catholics in general to share the absolute doctrines of the Abolitionists. From a passage in the preface it would appear that Dr. Kenrick has received more encouragement in the prosecution of his labours from the American hierarchy than from the Propaganda; and it is obvious that in a country where almost all can read, where the spirit of freedom and inquiry is strong, and where Catholics live surrounded by every denomination of Protestants, a very different degree of familiarity with the Scriptures must prevail than in most Catholic countries. This is in appearance an inversion of the original idea, which caused the unrestricted use of the Bible to be forbidden in heretical countries, whilst the same economy and reserve were not used in places where the whole people was orthodox. And yet the principle is still the same. The use of the Bible by the laity is regulated by the degree of instruction they possess. Now, in countries of mixed religions, the clergy have many more inducements to instruct their flocks especially in matters pertaining to Scripture than in countries where religious knowledge is not promoted by controversy; and the Catholic layman in America, England, or Germany, is better prepared to read the Bible than in Italy or Spain. The danger is, that in countries where Protestants are unknown, Catholics may acquiesce in the ignorance which necessarily deprives them of the sacred books, and that it may come to be considered a normal and natural condition to be without them. Féne-

lon has shown that it is as important to prepare the faithful for the knowledge of Scripture as to protect them against its abuse. "We must never separate two maxims of the Church : one is to give the Scriptures to those only who are already prepared to read them with advantage ; the other is to labour incessantly to prepare them for it. If you are content to suppose all the faithful prepared for it, without effectually preparing them, you encourage curiosity, presumption, impudent criticism, and you give it the Bible itself to work on. If, on the contrary, you always suppose that the faithful are not sufficiently prepared to read it, without ever seriously labouring to prepare them, you deprive them of the consolation and the fruit which the early Christians perpetually derived from Holy Writ. My conclusion is, that we must work without ceasing to prepare the faithful for this study, that only those can be reckoned truly instructed and solidly confirmed in Jesus Christ who are in a position to digest the bread of the strong."

8. Dr. Piper, with all his devotion to the interests of his communion, exhibits in his Calendar great equity and truthfulness. He seems quite uninfluenced by that malicious spirit to which Protestant writers often sacrifice truth, when they have to speak of the customs and the festivals of the Catholic Church. He indulges in no irony ; he nowhere wilfully disguises facts ; he every where speaks seriously and respectfully. This merit, though negative, is so rare, that we are really sorry not to be able to recommend Dr. Piper's little work on other grounds.

The book includes two dissertations and a chronicle. The first dissertation treats of a calendar and ecclesiastical *computus*, which is found in the *Hortus deliciarum*, a kind of encyclopædia written by Herrad of Landsperg, Abbess of Hohenberg, in Alsatia, in 1175. Dr. Piper begins with a few words about certain dates found in some calendars:—the Creation, March 18th; the chronology of Paradise; the beginning and end of the Deluge ; the death of Moses; the return of the child Jesus from Egypt ; the end of the Temptation in the Wilderness; the marriage of Cana; the first sermon of Jesus, May 1st; the Transfiguration; the Passion, March 25th; and the Resurrection, March 27th. If it is worth while to write at all on such questions, it is worth while to do it with completeness and accuracy ; and Dr. Piper has not given himself the trouble to read what has already been written upon them. For instance, for the dates of the death and resurrection of our Lord, March 25th and 27th, he only cites two Fathers, Tertullian and Augustin. F. Patrizzi's book, *De Evangelicis*, would have furnished him with the names of thirty-two more, all before Herrad's time. He is no less incomplete in the matter of calendars, as might be shown by comparing him with several writers ; for instance, with the Bollandist F. Tinnebroek's commentary on St. Vitalis, Bishop of Salzburg (*Acta SS.* tom. viii. Oct. p. 925, num. 40 sqq.). Dr. Piper insists on the mistake of reckoning the age of calendars by means of the years when Easter fell on the 27th of



March. What he says is true, but he seems to know very little of the controversy. He might have shown how the difficulty about the date of the death of St. Rupert, Bishop of Salzburg, and the conversion of the Bavarians and Carinthians came from this kind of confusion, as also did the doubt about the date of the martyrdom of St. Bercharius, Abbot of Moustier-en-Der. On this date the Bollandist F. Van Hecke has been led astray by Adso: *Obiit hic B. P. Bercharius anno ab Incarnatione Domini dcxcv . . . vi. kal. Aprilis, mane Dominicæ Resurrectionis* (Act. Sanct. tom. viii. Oct. p. 1005). F. Van Hecke rightly holds to the date 685, but he wrongly takes *mane Dominicæ Resurrectionis* to mean the morning of Easter Sunday; it means simply March 27th, a date given by an immense number of ancient calendars to the Resurrection.

We must make similar exceptions to Dr. Piper's explanation of what he calls the *Martyrology* of Herrad. Although this name is found in the manuscript, it is a mistake. The thing is a simple calendar. The difference is this. A calendar is a liturgical directory for one church; hence, as it is well known where the church is, and where the feast is celebrated, it does not put before the name of each saint *Romæ*, *Carthagine*, *Argentorati*, or the name of any other place where the feast is celebrated. But a martyrology is a compilation of many local calendars, and in it each saint has the locality of his cultus prefixed to his name. The only exceptions are the Irish martyrologies, and some abridgments of what is called the martyrology of St. Jerome. The most ancient martyrologies contained no particulars or abridgments of the lives of the saints, or of the lessons for their office; afterwards these additions were made. The Latins gave no new name to the augmented martyrologies, but the Greeks called them Menologies, or sometimes Synaxaries, though this name is more usually restricted to liturgic calendars. If Dr. Piper had remembered this, he would not have called his metrical calendar a "menology."

Dr. Piper has allowed himself to be led away by a common mistake, which has some support among ecclesiastical writers. He takes the word *natalis* to mean the day of the saint's death, the day when he began another life. The true meaning of the word is simply *feast*. Mazochius has demonstrated this point of criticism in his Commentaries on the Calendar of Naples;<sup>1</sup> and Muratori's dissertation *de sanctorum martyrum natalibus*, in his edition of the works of St. Paulinus, does not invalidate the proof. The festival, even when it commemorated the saint's death, was usually held not on the anniversary of the death, but on that of the burial, or *depositio*; and that there was generally some interval between those days, we might easily show from inscriptions on tombs in the catacombs. The sacramentary of St. Leo shows that new collects were composed for the funeral masses of the ancient Popes, and that these collects were recited every year at the anniversary. This custom still existed in the eighth century; and the Cavaliere de' Rossi has published, from

<sup>1</sup> Tom. iii. p. 765.

the inscriptions, the collects for the anniversary of Pope Gregory III.<sup>2</sup> It was this custom that induced the Congregation of Rites more than once to refuse to confirm a cultus of great persons the only argument for which was that ancient missals contained collects for them. Still, these anniversaries of the *depositio*, celebrated originally for the repose of the dead, were often changed afterwards into feasts; and when that was done, the day of the death was never substituted for that of the *depositio*. Hence in the old calendars we continually read *depositio martyrum*, *depositio episcoporum*, and the like. In spite, therefore, of all the play upon words which we find in old writers about the heavenly birthday of the saints, we cannot attach to the word *natalis* any other meaning but that of *feast*.

But Dr. Piper's most surprising idea is the notion that the calendar of Herrad is in any way remarkable, or that her nuns who used it wanted another written calendar to explain the first, where the festivals were only indicated by signs. It is odd that a learned professor of Berlin, who has written *Karls des Grossen Kalendarium und Ostertafel*, who has composed a special work upon the oldest Christian calendars, and who has for several years past been commissioned by the government to publish yearly the royal calendar of the Prussian Court, should not know that in old times calendars like that of Herrad were the commonest things in the world; and that so far from needing a special key to decipher them, they were intended for the ignorant who could not read; that they were then called, as they are now, "shepherd's calendars," and that they are still in use among some rustic populations. They were nowhere commoner than among the Scandinavians, who called them Run, Runstock, or Runstaf, because they were cut sometimes on little sticks or wooden tablets that were carried in the pocket, sometimes on staves and walking-sticks, which Olaus Magnus therefore calls *baculi annales*. They are also found sculptured on stone, or drawn in books. Traces of the custom may still be seen in the popular almanacs which are published at Liège.

Wormius, in his *Fasti Danici*, has published a quantity of these calendars. Luigi Frati, assistant at the Museum of Bologna, published in 1841 a long treatise *di un calendario runico della pontificia università di Bologna*. This calendar, the most complete known, was made in 1514, within the ecclesiastical province of Rheims, and is signed with two names, Moses Anthoinne Pollet and Simon Vincent de Maom (Macon?). It is formed of eight box-wood tablets, and comprises not only the fixed feasts, but also the elements for calculating the moveable feasts, all the ecclesiastical observances, the number of days in each month, the length of the days and nights, the Sunday letters, and a list of lucky and unlucky days, as "revealed to the prophet Job." All this is indicated by Scandinavian runes, and by the proper emblems of each saint. Many more

<sup>2</sup> Due Monumenti inediti spettanti a due Concilii Romani de' secoli viii. ed xi.



works might be named, where calendars of the same kind may be seen.<sup>3</sup>

Of these symbolic calendars, that of Herrad is one of the most insignificant yet published. It only contains the symbols of the fixed feasts, of the Egyptian days, and the golden numbers, not written in runes, but in Roman characters. Not one has been edited with less intelligence. Dr. Piper has not even deciphered all the names of the saints whose signs are given. But to make up, he dwells at great length on the ecclesiastical *computus* of Herrad. What there is remarkable in her *computus*, we cannot find; it is the same as thousands of others; her rules for calculating the moveable feasts may be found any where. Dr. Piper surely forgets the rule,

“ . . . studiorum ostendere fructus,  
Non studia . . . ”

He is no happier in his second dissertation, on the Anglo-Saxon calendars. There are many printed documents which he did not know, and many still in manuscript of which he knew, but of which he failed to procure copies. We will transcribe the whole title of one book that he seems to have known nothing about: “A Memorial of ancient British Piety; or, a British Martyrology, giving a short account of all such Britons as have been honoured of old amongst the saints, or have otherwise been renowned for their extraordinary piety and sanctity; to which is annexed a translation of two ancient Saxon manuscripts, relating to the burying places of the English saints, from the library of Bennet College, Cambridge, Nos. 147 and 149. London, W. Needham, 1761.” In this book he might have seen that the number of Anglo-Saxon saints is infinitely greater than he imagines, and that the calendars on which he relies are altogether deceptive.

He first gives what he calls the general Anglo-Saxon calendar, which he prints side by side with a calendar compiled from Bede's Latin homilies; a metrical calendar, which he terms a poetical Anglo-Saxon menology; and another compiled from the Anglo-Saxon homilies of Aelfric. As might be expected, scarcely a trace of Anglo-Saxon is left in compilations like these. Then he passes to what he calls the Anglo-Saxon conventual calendars, which he takes from the Latin metrical calendar of Bede, the homilies of Aelfric on the saints, and two Ms. calendars formerly used in the cathedral and abbey-church of Winchester. How he could have got his theory of two orders of calendars out of these materials, we cannot comprehend. In one of the Winchester calendars he finds a few names of monks; but he does not seem to know that this cathedral, like many others in England, was attached to a monastery of Benedictines.

More than once Dr. Piper tries to deduce the age of the calendar from the Paschal table; thus he gets the date 978 for the first Win-

<sup>3</sup> For instance, in the History of the Reformation at Amsterdam (in Dutch); in Camden's *Britannia*, ed. Gough, tom. ii. p. 379; in the *Mémoires de l'Institut de France*, tom. ix. p. 233, &c.

chester calendar. But, he adds, the name of St. Elphege, martyred in 1012, seems to be a difficulty; and if this name was originally in the calendar, its date must be after that year. He might have gone further, and said that the Paschal tables prove nothing; for the calendar-makers did not always make new ones, but often merely copied the old. He would have been quite safe, seeing that his two Winchester calendars are neither as old as 978 nor as 1012, but more than a century later than the latter date, and therefore not Anglo-Saxon at all, but Anglo-Norman. Both of them contain the feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, which was first celebrated in England in 1127. But they are earlier than the end of the twelfth century, because the name of St. Thomas à Becket is not found in them; and even than 1165, when St. Bernard, whose cultus spread rapidly in all directions, was canonised by Pope Alexander III. If Dr. Piper had any special liking for the usages of Winchester, he would have done better if he had collected the *addenda* made there to the martyrology of Usuard. These he might have found in the Codex Usuardinus Altempsianus, which Sollerius used for his edition, and which is nothing more or less than the ancient martyrology of Usuard adapted for Winchester use. This martyrology contains neither the feast of the Conception, nor even that of St. Elphege. It is a rather ancient monument of the Anglo-Saxon Church.

It is no less wonderful that Dr. Piper, with so few data before him,—two calendars compiled from two books of homilies, two metrical calendars, and the Anglo-Norman calendar of Winchester,—should have ventured upon all kinds of statistical comparisons about the cultus of saints among the Anglo-Saxons. To prepare himself for such a work, he should have got together all the old cathedral calendars and the chief monastic ones, together with the martyrologies of most common use in England. But as he had no suspicion of this necessity, his work has not the slightest value. He did not even consult the prefaces which the Bollandists have put to the martyrologies of Bede, Florus, Usuard, Pseudo-Jerome, &c.; nor does he appear to have asked any Catholic of his acquaintance to explain to him the meaning of the calendars of particular churches.

We have nothing to say about the political chronicle which Dr. Piper has strangely associated with his archæological labours, except that in it he seems to rejoice in the success which the "pure Gospel" is obtaining in Italy by means of Garibaldi and his crew of revolutionists. It may perhaps serve for an index to the newspapers of 1859 and 1860.

9. This remarkable and very interesting volume is the result—a triumphant one for the author—of what seems to have been an unworthy attempt on the part of more popular and influential, but much less learned and less accurate antiquaries, to throw slight upon the author's former researches into the history of York Cathedral. A publication entitled *The Fabric Rolls of York Minster*, edited by Mr. Raine, the Secretary of the Surtees Society, having



appeared in 1859, wherein the extracts from the Ms. York Fabric Rolls, given in Mr. Browne's History of the Cathedral, are stigmatised as "meagre and sometimes inaccurate," the learned writer of the present work has retaliated with damaging effect on his too rash adversary, and has shown, not only that his own extracts were *not* inaccurate, but that Mr. Raine himself has altered, garbled, mis-transcribed, and misinterpreted the same rolls in very many and very important particulars. In a word, he has shown that Mr. Raine undertook a work which very few indeed are competent to do thoroughly, and which Mr. Raine certainly could not do,—to decipher and explain the entries in Catholic rolls and register accounts made some five centuries ago.

In proof of his assertion, Mr. Browne devotes not less than thirty-four octavo pages of double columns solely to the exposure of Mr. Raine's inaccuracies, omissions, and false readings of his Mss. This certainly is an instance of merited exposure; and it is not only very temperately expressed, though with something of the just indignation of a writer unfairly slighted and somewhat cruelly wronged, but it is a complete and absolute vindication of the author's own very superior competency to deal with these ancient documents. Mr. Raine, it appears, had a way of his own of stating "*deest caput Rotuli*" (p. 27), which Mr. Browne calls (p. 28) "the usual form of apology for his ignorance." One roll, or *compotus*, dated Jan. 7th, 1475, is thus stated by Mr. Raine to be headless and dateless; on which Mr. B. thus remarks:

"Unfortunately for his statement, the Roll itself is headed, or at least was headed when last I saw it, *Quintus compotus Domini Willelmi Ward custodis Fabrice facta in crastino Epiphanie Domini, anno Domini millissimo, CCC<sup>mo</sup> lxx quinto*.

"The liberty of changing dates seems with my assailant to have had no restriction; for he has invented a *twentieth day of the Kalends* for the month of August. He has given the day of a month as the day of a year. He has disregarded the number of a year; the month of a year; and the day of a month; and in several instances gives neither dates nor reference to the pages in the Registers."

Of these and other still more grave literary charges, Mr. Browne of course adduces proofs. Having disposed of the purely literary errors, he proceeds to discuss certain theories on the fabric itself, and the dates of its various parts, put forward by Mr. Raine and Professor Willis; and we must say both of these writers are somewhat severely handled, and many hasty and crude guesses are brought, in a very masterly way, to the test either of direct documentary evidence or of facts by no means in accordance with their statements. Mr. Browne gives somewhat at length, and in a very interesting narrative, the history of the building of the present great choir of York Cathedral in three separate portions, beginning with the eastern, which was commenced in 1361, and completed for the use of divine service about 1415. The second part he considers was roofed-in about 1420; the third, which included the piers, choir-arch, and panelling

inside the great tower, he believes to have been completed about 1434. Professor Willis had supposed the east end of the choir was finished in 1373.

We should like some further investigation to be made than has yet been attempted on the union of the exceedingly ornate west front with the exceedingly plain details of the nave. The west front, as it now is, must have been an after-thought; and so were both of the west towers, for the lower stages of these are only adapted compartments of the original nave, and the great tower-buttresses (north and south) are only the original nave buttresses between the windows, cased and additionally thickened.

The nave, as it now stands, was begun in 1291. That date is probably too early for the rather well-developed decorated details of the windows, the internal panels, and the bases and plans of the piers. The whole of the west front is of a much more florid period, probably as late as 1330; and as the great west window, which has *flowing* and not *geometric* tracery, is known to have been glazed in 1338, it is probable that the whole west front had been continuously in progress some eight or ten years previously, and after a changed and much richer design. The proof that the great tower-buttresses were cased after the adjoining windows were built, is found in the fact that they now encroach on the space left in all the other bays between the buttress and the window jamb. Originally, we think, one great west tower (as at Ely) was contemplated; but the piers internally were built after that idea had been abandoned.

We cannot sufficiently praise the immense pains in the way of documentary research, as well as the close examination bestowed on every detail and almost every stone in this wonderful fabric, which characterise Mr. Browne's volume. To him it has been a labour of love for a life; and however his opponents may try to ignore his labours, he may be sure there are many who very highly appreciate them.

10. The third volume of the History of Champagne covers a period of no more than thirty years, and the reign of only one duke, Henry, surnamed the Liberal. Henry took part in the conflict between Church and State under Alexander III.; he assisted the sons of Henry Plantagenet against their father; and he took the cross twice, with an interval of more than forty years. These transactions, and his extraordinary munificence towards the Church, would not invest the volume in which they are recorded with any very general interest, were it not that M. de Jubainville has devoted two hundred pages to a most minute description of the internal administration of the duchy of Champagne in the twelfth century. This account, founded on extensive research, and illustrated by a great number of unpublished documents, is full of instruction for the history of civilisation and of the Church, and for the study of the feudal system. The most interesting part is the explanation of the mode in which centralisation in the petty terri-



tories prepared the way for the later unity and absolutism of the monarchy, and resisted the growth of local self-government.

In expounding his own ideas, M. de Jubainville gives us an insight, which is extremely curious, into the state of political thought among sober Frenchmen. He combines together and confounds in a marvellous jumble the spirit of conquest, the spirit of Catholicism, and the tendency towards a centralising despotism. It is a sign of health and strength with him to aim at increase. A monarch obeys this law by concentrating power, a nation by extending its boundaries. The morality of these actions is a question of opportunity. Christianity, which unites all men, recommends the destruction of those barriers which separate nations by maintaining their independence, and which divide fellow-countrymen by means of local authorities. Self-government is identical with Paganism; conquest is not distinguishable from charity. The outlines of this philosophy of history are sketched as follows (pp. 114-120): "The spirit of aggrandisement, which is no other than the spirit of progress, is one of the conditions of the existence of all the powerful intellects that govern and conduct mankind. . . . . There is no great prince or great administrator who has not sought to increase his power, either within or beyond the territory which he governed. There is no great people that did not conquer. . . . . The conquests to be regretted are those which, being undertaken prematurely, were lost as soon as won, and did not serve the cause of social unity. . . . . The provinces were the transition from local individualism to French unity. . . . . A creation of the Middle Ages, the provincial spirit was, so to speak, the road which led the minds of men from the narrow municipal spirit of the ancients to the vast conceptions of our public spirit, which the present limits no longer satisfy, and which seems to anticipate the future, and to wish to embrace the universe. . . . . Christianity has had an immense share in this revolution. . . . . It overturned the altars of the local and family gods. It taught men that they sprang from one Father, and for all acts of worship, even the most august, it distinguishes neither place nor race. . . . . Modern society is formed upon the model offered by the Church and the religious order. As the Church demolished the statues of the *Lares*, so the civil power prohibited the hereditary feuds of families. The towns have lost, after their local divinities, the political privileges which raised up barriers between them. . . . . The royal power was for centuries the instrument with which Providence conducted us towards this end. But before the action of the monarchy had exceeded the narrow circle in which it is confined during the first period of the Capetian era, the great barons pursued the same course in each province. The history of our Counts exhibits them gradually levelling the local obstacles, and commencing that centralisation of which, as of all great things, so much evil is spoken, but which is the character, the life, and the strength of modern civilisation, and the continuous development and voluntary but inevitable appli-

cation of which to the whole machinery of society,—to industry, agriculture, commerce, and science, as well as to government,—appears, if no catastrophe intervenes, the necessary law and the key of the future."

11. In June 1550, while the Emperor Charles V. was going from Brussels to Augsburg, he beguiled the tediousness of the ascent of the Rhine by dictating to his secretary, Van Male, a narrative of his expeditions from 1515 to 1548. The completion of these "Commentaries" was put off by ill-health and press of affairs; and in 1552, when he was obliged to fly from Innsbruck, he sent the unfinished manuscript to his son Philip in Spain, with injunctions not to let it be published till a convenient time had elapsed. A Portuguese translation, either of this narrative, or of a similar memorial which the Emperor seems to have dictated to Van Male at Yuste after his abdication, has just been discovered in the Imperial Library at Paris. And the Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove has the merit of being the first to publish a French translation from this version of a very important document, which, he suspects, was carefully suppressed by Philip II.—perhaps for fear of making too clear the divergence of his own policy from that of his father.

The style of the Commentaries is a curious mixture of imperial dignity, Christian humility, chivalrous honesty and rectitude, and diplomatic caution and reserve. The Emperor, though he writes with his crown on his head and his sceptre in his hand, is ever ready to acknowledge his own faults and mistakes, but not ready to be saddled with those of his counsellors and allies, on whom he always contrives to fasten their own burdens. The singularity in his history which seems to have struck him most, and which is the key-note of his Commentaries, is the way in which his designs were either wholly or partially frustrated just in the nick of their completion, and often by the fault of those very persons from whom he considered he had most right to look for assistance and sympathy. It is probably for this reason that he is so particular in informing us of the circumstances of each of his numerous attacks of gout. Of his enemies he speaks with great moderation and even good-will; and he seems to have had a special benevolence towards France, which he always treated with great management, and with a spirit very contrary to the traditional policy of France towards the empire. He was impatient of the Roman policy, which at that time might be expressed by the watchword "Italy for the Italians," and which consisted in alternate hostility to, or alliance with, France or Austria, according as the one or the other appeared the more to threaten the cause of Italian nationality; and, throughout his Commentaries, it is the Roman Court which he continually points at as the chief cause of much of his ill success.

Charles had a real political genius; and his mistakes seem to have arisen from his allowing his interpretation of what he took for providential signs to override the doctrines and demonstrations of political cause and effect. Thus his earlier idea, that the Reformation was



a movement which could not be controlled by violence, was entirely changed by the ease with which he overcame the political revolt of Gueldres. "Forasmuch," he says, "as his majesty always held that it was impossible to put down, by the strong hand, so obstinate and great a power as that of the Protestants, he was in perplexity what to do to remedy an evil that imported him so nearly. But God, who never forsakes those who seek Him, however little they deserve it, not only gave the Emperor the grace of so rapid a conquest of Gueldres, but, by the experience of what happened there, opened his eyes, and enlightened his understanding, in such sort that it no longer seemed impossible to him to overcome that great pride by the strong hand." He considered the Pope and Emperor to be the twin heads of Christendom, wielding the spiritual and temporal power respectively, and he thought that the care of Providence was as plain in its dealings with the Empire as in its protection of the Papedom.

Hence he speaks of his opponents and hinderers not in the tone of one who considers them to be personal enemies, but of one who thinks them to be marring God's work. The whole narrative of the first communication of his plans of conquest to the Holy See is visibly tinged with this feeling. It was at Worms, where he and his brother Ferdinand had met at the Diet:—

"The Emperor considered that the opportunity was good for putting the project into execution, and that for this end it was necessary to have the aid of the Pope's spiritual and temporal power, as he was the person most bound to put in order and to cure these great evils. Their majesties therefore agreed, and swore to keep the secret, under the condition that if it was not kept they should not be bound to that part of it which was revealed, and they resolved to communicate their determination to Cardinal Farnese, grandson and then legate of Pope Paul, who just at that time arrived at Worms. Whereupon, after he had sworn to keep the secret, and had accepted the above condition, they gave him to understand that if his Holiness would aid them with his temporal and spiritual power, their majesties, considering that kind and conciliatory measures were of no use, and the obstinacy and insolence of the Protestants were growing daily more and more unendurable, would undertake by forcible measures to remedy and prevent their obstinacy and insolence. Cardinal Farnese was so startled by this overture, that though he had previously said that he had full powers to treat on all measures that might tend to remedy the present evils, he would go no further in the negotiation. And when their majesties said, that as he would not take upon himself to resolve, the best thing he could do was to consult his Holiness with all diligence by an express that might bring him the answer, he would do nothing of the kind, but chose to be his own messenger, saying that he would make good speed. And, in fact, his speed was such as suited a personage of his dignity, but not such as the kind of business required. His first act on his arrival in Rome was to act in direct contradiction to his oath, and to the condition imposed by his majesty. In fact, his Holiness at once convoked a

Consistory, where there are always contrary opinions and parties, and communicated to it the offers of the Emperor. His Holiness chose as his legate the same Cardinal Farnese, and for general of the Church the Duke Ottavio, his brother. The other chief officers were forthwith appointed, and the drum was beaten to enlist soldiers, who were publicly called to share in this holy expedition and to avenge the sack of Rome.

"His majesty, considering that when the above proposition was made to Cardinal Farnese it was near midsummer, and that conformably to the speed which the said Cardinal could make, the answer would come too late, and in a season too advanced to begin collecting an army and making the preparations necessary for so great an affair, and also suspecting that the secret would not be kept, despatched an express to his Holiness to represent to him that the project could not be executed this year, but that it was necessary to keep the secret, otherwise he should no longer deem himself bound by the offers he had made. But as the secret was broken, and all the Protestants were warned, the Emperor conducted himself in such manner as to prevent them believing the reports that were current" (p. 104).

This passage will serve to give an idea of this important historical document, which throws the clearest light on the real ideas and intentions of the man who was, on the whole, the most significant figure of the sixteenth century, since he was the Emperor with whose reign the history of medieval Christendom comes to an end, and that of modern European politics begins.

12. There are no literary historians more ingenious than the French, but their literary histories observe the æsthetical rather than the substantial qualities of the writings they describe. A formal interest is attached to the literature of France, which causes writers to be overlooked whose works are deficient in the conventional conditions of art, or who are too peculiar or eccentric to be safe guides of taste. Those who did not follow the great models were set aside by critics, too attentive to the principal currents to take note of eddies, and too much absorbed by the grand movement of literature to listen to protests against the recognised canons. A field of research was left uncultivated by the chief authorities, which has been occupied by a number of less famous, but hardly less useful, inquirers; and the pursuit of taste and form has been completed by the pursuit of curiosities. A school of writers has arisen addicted to minute and laborious investigation, but not apt to generalise, and more apt in the discovery of biographical details than in the interpretation of a nation's history. This separation of two things equally essential to a knowledge of national literature deprives French criticism of the higher scientific character, which is neither satisfied with collecting curiosities, nor with establishing rules of style, but seeks to understand as a whole the intellectual achievements, aberrations, and failures of every people.



M. Victor Fournel, whose most recent work is on the forgotten and independent writers who escaped the classical current of the seventeenth century, has been active in exploring the curiosities of literature, and bringing to light many popular errors and oversights. His religious sentiments appear to be those of a sincere Catholic; and the bitterness with which he speaks of the theology of the Jansenists is not mitigated by that admiration which is almost universal among French men of letters for the genius and learning of the leaders of that party. The reaction against the classical method of literary history, if it restricts somewhat the ambition and even the intellectual range, of its followers, saves them at least from the immoral worship of genius and the idolatries of eloquence, which has been so common in the rival school, and encourages them to prefer substance to form and sound. M. Fournel expresses his astonishment that the French infidels should have been admirers of Jansenism. "Considered either as a philosophical or a religious doctrine, the rationalists ought to have rejected Jansenism as much as the Catholics" (p. 438). Certainly the opinions of Arnauld had nothing to recommend them to Voltaire; and the early Jansenists, who wrote some of the greatest works of controversy against the Protestants, would have displayed equal hostility and equal power against the scepticism of the eighteenth century. But the sceptics rightly judged the party, not by its intentions, but by its results. The Jansenists were as averse as the Jesuits to Protestantism, and yet the chief element of Calvinism lurked in their system. In like manner they held free-thinking in horror, and yet they degenerated into freethinkers. During the last century the theological period of Jansenism came to an end, and what remained was chiefly a spirit of resistance to the authority and to the organisation of the Church, which threw a large portion of the school into connection with the infidels. It drifted gradually from heresy into mere negation.

The most important personage whose works are discussed in M. Fournel's new volume is St. Simon, and a chapter on his Jansenism is very well written. Ranke, in the fifth volume of his *History of France*, subjects St. Simon's *Memoirs* to that species of microscopic criticism, by comparison and analysis, in which he so greatly excels. Although his conclusion is extremely unfavourable to the credibility of the great historian, the religious opinions of the Duke, the strongest and most subtle influence by which his judgment was warped, are entirely omitted from the inquiry. M. Fournel has used this instrument of criticism; he shows that St. Simon is never so apt to make mistakes as in speaking of the Jansenists, and that these are the motives which guided him in describing the character of Madame de Maintenon, which is the point on which he has met with the most damaging refutation.

13. The quantity of the published writings of Leibniz has been almost doubled within the last twenty years, and the result has been a nearly proportionate augmentation of his fame. His *Annales*

*Imperii*, which first appeared in 1843, showed that he had made discoveries which historians did not arrive at till long after his death, and their earlier publication would have saved his learned countrymen much toil and many errors. The successive appearance of several collections of his letters gradually modified the notion formerly entertained of his religious opinions, and proved that he had not only a speculative and scholarlike attachment to the Catholic system, but that he was, on religious grounds, a more ardent advocate of the temporal power of the Pope than any that it has found at the present day. "I affirm," he says, "that the visible Catholic Church is infallible in all matters of faith which are necessary for salvation, by a special assistance of the Holy Spirit, which was promised to her." And in another letter (of the year 1680) he says: "We must discuss whether, in order to give authority to the Popes, they must have some considerable temporal power. I confess that they would not need it, if the clergy were thoroughly united with the Holy See, and if they lived in a manner to inspire the people with respect; for there is no Christian monarch who would dare to offend such a body. But as things now are, I should rather approve the addition of all Italy to the patrimony of St. Peter, instead of dismembering it. For it would be desirable that the Pope should be sufficiently powerful to be in some measure the arbitrator of the quarrels of Christian princes. Because, the force of religion being deemed imaginary among the profane of this corrupt age, it would be well to add to it the secular arm." In the earlier volumes of the great edition of Leibniz which has been undertaken by the Count Foucher de Careil, there are considerable additions to what was known of his religious writings. Hitherto, only twenty-five of his letters to Bossuet, and eleven of Bossuet in reply, have been known to their editors. We have now ninety-two of Leibniz and twenty-five of Bossuet, besides many other letters connected with the project for the union of the Churches, which make our knowledge of that important epoch far more complete.

Volume IV. contains political treatises and letters of the period of the Peace of Utrecht, which Leibniz, in conjunction with Prince Eugene, strongly opposed. In an introduction on his character as a political writer, Count Foucher de Careil, while doing justice to his great eminence as a jurist, insists upon his incapacity as a politician; and says, that though he was always legally in the right, all the great public causes which he pleaded were decided against him. The distinction here drawn between right and policy is unjust. It is true that the verdict of history is given against those who apply the dead letter of a written code to the great complications of politics; and that, as it is the nature of states to change, and of systems of jurisprudence to remain unaltered, the moments of crisis must repeatedly occur. But this is true only of artificial forms of law. In a healthy and normal condition of things, law follows the course of history, and provides as amply for the possibility of change as for the maintenance of existing rights. The greatest jurist is he who best dis-



tinguishes the temporary and transitory elements of law, which represent the conditions of a particular time, from those in which its spirit is incorporated and which are the basis and criterion of future development. M. Foucher de Careil appears to adopt the immoral and subversive position of the Legitimists and of the Revolution, which consists in putting the past and the future in opposition to each other, and in giving an exclusive validity to one or the other. He is hardly consistent with himself when he says, with perfect truth, of Leibniz, "Admirable in conception and for inspiring an upright and elevated policy, active and even energetic when it was necessary, he would doubtless have been always in advance of his age—an unfortunate position for a politician" (p. 41). Plato, when he taught that philosophers ought to govern mankind, overlooked this necessity for a sympathetic mediocrity in the rulers of men; an element admirably supplied by hereditary monarchy, by the influence of broad acres in the state, and by the custom of diluting councils and cabinets with a certain number of men whose intellectual affinities with the masses to be governed connect and reconcile the rulers with the ruled.

The chief work in this volume is a *Lettre à un Milord Tory*, entitled *Paix d'Utrecht inexcusable*. The title, or rather the address of this letter, has led the editor into a mistake which is not quite unconnected with the political error to which we have adverted. He imagines, that as Leibniz wrote to a Tory—though the correspondent is in reality fictitious—he was an adherent of that party. "The whole," he says, "is mixed up with a discussion of political parties in England, and with pretty strong attacks upon the Whigs and the French cabal" (p. lxiv.). In fact, the French party were the Jacobites; and Leibniz is vigorously assailing the policy of Bolingbroke, and defending the principles of the Whigs, which were his own, and whom he calls *les bien intentionnés*, or *le bon parti*. He was bitterly opposed to that political atheism which denies all public obligations, sets up the arbitrary will of man above the will of God, and teaches that there is an authority superior to the law residing either in the sovereign or in the people. "England," he says, "was notoriously on the eve of being subjected to despotism, by the introduction of a creature of the King of France;" and "owes her liberty and her salvation to the aid given by Holland to the Prince of Orange." On the other hand, it is "a principle of the enemies of monarchy that places the supreme power in the people."

14. The course of modern speculation has not been favourable to the renown of a writer whose zeal for religion isolated him among the French philosophers of the eighteenth century, while his mysticism threw doubts upon his orthodoxy. For different reasons, Catholics, Protestants, and Rationalists, were alike deterred from studying the works of Saint-Martin, until Baader—the most profound, the most religious, and at the same time the most mystical of German metaphysicians—proclaimed their extraordinary value. But Baader him-

self is seldom read, and his protection has been of little use to the popularity of the French mystic. Saint-Martin is still surrounded by obscurity, and is only remembered as a strange eccentric writer,—a dreamer, if not a charlatan, the counterpart of Swedenborg and almost of Cagliostro, whom the title of one of his books, *The Crocodile, a magical Epic in a hundred and two Cantos*, consigns to literary proscription. "Yet," says his biographer, "in respect of ideals and moral aspirations, I know no contemporary life, seek it where I will, that can be preferred to his."

M. Matter writes the life of Saint-Martin under great advantages. His former works on the Gnostics and the Neo-Platonists prove him to be intimate with that branch of religious thought, Oriental rather than European, which, in the form of Pantheism, Dualism, or Emanation, has left its trace on almost every period of Christian speculation, and is the source from which Saint-Martin derives his most characteristic ideas. He has also been able to use many unpublished papers, and has been so fortunate as to obtain a copy of the book of Martinez Pasqualis, which is so rare that it was generally supposed to exist only in manuscript; and he has thus for the first time made known the doctrines of that mysterious Jew who initiated Saint-Martin into the secrets of the hidden science. But with all this, M. Matter possesses a serious disqualification for his task. He has the coldest, the most prosaic, and the most unimaginative of minds; and, with the unsympathetic common sense of a rationalising French Protestant, he labours, often in vain, to unravel the delicate web of Saint-Martin's spiritual mysticism. The first thing that strikes the student of Saint-Martin's system is, that his warm and earnest devotion to religion, and his hatred of materialism and unbelief, were almost entirely dissociated from any attachment to the Church as a community. "Though a very pious Catholic, he never says a word of the differences between Christian communions; in his life, as in his works, he knew but two classes of men—those who wish to belong to God, and those who do not. The first are his brethren, whatever their country; the others his enemies, whatever the name they bear. That is his theory. He honoured Voltaire and Lalande, and he declares Rousseau much better than himself" (p. 441). He was too much absorbed in the privileges which his doctrines gave him to share what belongs to the most illiterate of mankind, and he neglected the regular channels of grace. "Unity," he wrote, "is hardly to be found in associations; it is only attainable in our individual junction with God" (p. 342). Thus it was possible for a man, not really deficient either in humility or kindness of heart, to write of the French clergy at the moment of their greatest sufferings, "Providence will know how to cause a religion to be born in the heart of man . . . which will no longer be liable to be infected by priestly traffic, and the breath of imposture, like that which we have just beheld eclipsed with the ministers who dishonoured it" (p. 253). M. Matter cites this passage with a just rebuke. In speaking of the serene resignation of Saint-Martin's last hours, he quotes the following fine



passage from his works: "It is not in court that the advocate receives the remuneration of the cause he pleads; it is out of the court, and after the trial. Such is my history, and such also is my resignation at not being rewarded in this lower world" (p. 341).

In speaking of the Abbé Fournié, next to Saint-Martin the chief writer of the school, M. Matter seems to us to have fallen into a not very important error. He quotes a manuscript note on his copy of the rare book of Fournié, to the effect that he would not allow the continuation to appear, because it contained many things which could not be published; and M. Matter takes the trouble to speculate as to what these *arcana* can have been. Fournié is stated to have said this in June 1819. But in 1822 he assured Baader that his second volume was about to appear (Baader's *Sämmtliche Werke*, iv. 117). It cannot, therefore, have been suppressed, as the author thinks, on account of visions, or of those magical and theurgical practices which brought discredit on the sect. He explains, with the help of the work of Martinez, *De la Réintégration*, the origin and purpose of these operations. He believed that superior beings were enveloped with mankind in a common fall, which was to be redeemed by a common atonement. "Between terrestrial and celestial spirits, the community of their eternal destinies of high aspirations secured, in the eyes of Martinez, communion in the act of regeneration imposed on all; and to effect this it was necessary that they should unite in the same acts. The coöperation of the superior spirits is secured to the lower, if these can interest the former in their fate, and command their good-will by means of learned practices. . . . They are intermediary powers between God and man" (pp. 19-21). As a master of the Alexandrian theology, M. Matter ought to have informed his readers that the germ of these ideas is to be found in the works of the early Fathers, and that in substance they were never rejected by the Church. Origen believed that Christ died not for men only—that the heavens were redeemed with His blood, and that He atoned for the whole of the creation; and it has been deemed to confirm this interpretation of several passages of Holy Writ<sup>4</sup> that the Catholic Church sings on Good Friday,

"Terra, pontus, astra, mundus,  
Hoc lavantur sanguine."

See Görres's Preface to Sepp's *Leben Christi*, p. ciii.

15. The second of the two large volumes in which M. Mortimer-Ternaux has begun to write the History of the Reign of Terror, only reaches to the fall of the monarchy, in August 1792; that is, to a period many months before the Reign of Terror really commenced. The excuse for this, and the real merit of the book, is in the mass of new matter, which in this volume occupies nearly 130 pages of supplement. The attack on the Tuileries on the 10th of August; the weakness of the king, by which the lives of his defenders were

<sup>4</sup> Mark xiii. 27; Ephes. i. 10; Col. i. 20; Heb. ix. 23; &c.

sacrificed; and the unprovoked massacre of the guard; are the subjects upon which the interest is concentrated. Some of the details which are established, as it appears to us, with tolerable certainty, are extremely curious. The attack began at half-past ten, and was immediately repulsed; and the insurgents had withdrawn out of fire when the order of Louis XVI. arrived, commanding the soldiers to evacuate the palace. For some minutes after the last Swiss had left the Tuileries, their enemies did not venture to approach. The murderous effect of the Swiss muskets on the people below, and the fight on the stairs and in the hall, are entirely fictitious. The loss of the insurrectionary forces has been stated as high as four or five thousand, in order to explain and justify the murder of the Swiss in the garden. It appears from the documents now produced, that the whole number of killed and wounded on the popular side was under 160. All the sections were afterwards summoned to bring in a list of the names of those who had fallen, that they might be inscribed on monumental tablets, and the families pensioned. One of their presidents sent a reply which deserves to be quoted, our author truly says, on account of its naïveté: "The drum has been beat in all the section to discover whether there were any citizens who were killed on the 10th of August. No body has presented himself up to the present time."

16. The second part of the first volume of the Memoirs of Carnot by his son brings down the narrative to the establishment of the Directory, and includes, therefore, the whole of that portion of his life on which the gravest charges rest. "I have seen people," said Carnot, "who, after the portrait which certain journals had drawn of me, could not contain their surprise on seeing me, and could not believe that I was that terrible member of the Committee of Public Safety, the associate of Robespierre." As this book is professedly a filial panegyric, it might be expected that its readers would experience the same surprise at finding nothing recorded to the disadvantage of one who was a revolutionist, an infidel, and a regicide. But the son of Carnot has no standard of public morality from which such a character and such a career have any thing to apprehend; and the comparison between the ideas of the biographer and those of his hero is one of the most interesting things which the work suggests. M. Carnot, who was Minister of Public Instruction in 1848, tells his sons to believe "that the incense of all altars bears the same perfume before God, and that every prayer reaches heaven, in whatever language it is uttered." His political sentiments are less vague. He says of the Convention (p. 272), "an authority so legitimate had never governed France." Of the trial of the king (pp. 285-7), "Lewis XVI. had the nation itself for his tribunal—*c'est un privilège assez beau*. . . . He could not desire one more independent, less accessible to narrow passions or to corruption." After quoting his father's words, that the Convention had deliberated in presence of daggers, he adds (p. 293), "It is of course understood



that in writing these words, Carnot does not impute personal fear to men who so often proved their energy." The most serious difference between them is in their estimate of the character of Robespierre. This might be expected, seeing that Carnot was the colleague of the Dictator throughout the Reign of Terror, while the lot of his son has fallen in better times; but it could hardly be expected that a writer of the year 1862 would reproach his father, the terrorist, of having failed to appreciate the good qualities of the tyrant. "Carnot did not esteem the character of Robespierre; but he had never lived in intimacy with him, and many testimonies paint him in a favourable light" (p. 513). We have probably to thank the Emperor Napoleon III. for the following true remarks (p. 44): "The Frenchman is endowed with a restlessness which makes him averse to the yoke of the law. When it annoys him, he makes an effort to escape from it; he does not wait for its reform, but destroys it. The pretext of the public advantage justifies in his eyes every arbitrary act; and he accepts and applauds an enlightened despotism, because he always expects from it a progress which the law could not promise. . . . There is no country in Europe in which illegal acts, great and small, would be tolerated such as the soil of France beholds every day. All men with us are revolutionists or counter-revolutionists, and every one admits without scruple the violation of the law in the interest of his opinions. A government that respects the law appears timid, incompetent, unsuited to progress."

When Carnot first went up to Paris, he carried with him strong religious principles and a sincere piety, imbibed at the seminary where he was educated. These sentiments soon gave way to "a pure deism, unconnected with any external practices, to which he continued faithful without affectation or intolerance. . . . He moreover retained, as the fruit of his theological studies, a great admiration for the holy books of Christianity. He felt their beauties deeply, endeavoured to make others feel them, and attempted several times to reproduce them in a poetical paraphrase" (p. 90). In this, then, Carnot differed from the fanatics who surrounded him as much as in his political views. The statesman who organised victory, and prepared the conquests of Italy, Holland, Belgium, and the Rhine, was averse on principle to aggressive war. His ideal was "a civic organisation of the army, unsuited for conquest, but powerful on the frontier" (p. 27). Defensive wars alone he held to be legitimate (p. 36). "There can be no community or union between nations, but in consequence of a free and formal agreement; no one has the right to subject another to common laws without its express consent" (p. 297). This view was only modified by the theory of natural limits; a theory which recommended itself to a soldier, as the limits it points out are in reality the military frontier of France. "The ancient and natural limits of France are the Rhine, the Alps, and the Pyrenees; the portions which have been dismembered were in reality usurped" (p. 299). His dislike of war is the noblest trait

in the character of Carnot, whose authority in the government was due to his military knowledge. On one occasion when he explained some operations described in a despatch which Robespierre could not understand, Robespierre exclaimed, with a tone of jealousy rather than of humility, "You are fortunate; what would I give to be a soldier!" (p. 518). And on another occasion the same rival cried out, "*Je vous attends à la première défaite.*" They hated each other, but Carnot could not be spared; and he on his side deemed that a breach in the Committee would be the ruin of the State. "The sense of the political necessities," says Prieur, "prevailed in our minds over every thing else." Prieur's account of the internal condition of the Committee of Public Safety will be considered by many the most interesting part of the book. Carnot described Robespierre as a bad heart and a middling head. He thought St. Just superior to him, and Couthon insignificant. His strangest judgment was that on Barrère, whom he called "*un bon enfant.*"

The political system of Carnot may be gathered from several extracts given by his son from published and private documents. "The best government is that in which every thing is done by habit, by education, and not by variable precepts; in a word, where the rulers have least to do, just as the best clock is that which gives the maker least trouble" (p. 31). He voted very reluctantly for the death of the king, and justified it thirty years later as follows, "Do not kings cause men to be put to death, who conspire against them? Has not the people, the real sovereign, the same right? Evil causes have their martyrs as well as good. *Le meilleur a payé pour les méchants*" (p. 293). It is not easy for a regicide to take a more reasonable view. The only time when Carnot did not show a trace of common sense was when he inserted into his Declaration of Rights the clause, "Every citizen has the right of life and death over himself" (p. 303).

17. M. Dupin occupied, during a long career as advocate, deputy, and president of the Chamber, a very conspicuous place in France, though there are few men so considerable to whom so little personal interest attaches. Great attainments as a jurist, and a certain rude energy that passed for patriotism, made up in the public mind for the absence of statesmanlike qualities, for a ruthless wit that rendered him odious, and a vanity that made him often ridiculous. He was a friend of Louis Philippe, a leader of the Left Centre, and hater of the *Doctrinaires*. The fourth volume of his Memoirs, published in his eightieth year, and written without dignity, but also without pretensions to the historical style, extends over ten years, from 1839 to 1848; and contains abundance of facts, lively gossip, long speeches, and quotations from Cicero. In the midst of the excitement of the Eastern question, on the 21st of October 1840, Sébastiani was created a marshal. "It was considered," says M. Dupin, "a symptom of peace." His answer to the king, when he asked him to join the new ministry, or rather the recording of it, is inimitable. "Ah!



sire, il y a assez longtemps que l'on commence par moi, et qu'on finit par d'autres." The description of the impending fall of the dynasty, and of the alarming signs, is interesting, though it is not easy to say how much the author really observed at the time, and whether he speaks as a prophet or a historian. He points out with truth and power the great error of the *Doctrinaires* in the creation of what was called the *pays légal*, by making the middle class the basis of the political system. Whilst all was tranquil at Paris, in the summer of 1847, the provinces were agitated. "For the first time since 1789 the agitators have succeeded in separating the people from the middle class. . . . They will soon cry, Down with the *bourgeois*! as in 1793 they cried, Down with the nobles! down with the priests! . . . The doctrinaires had adopted the term *middle class*, to designate those who participated in power. But with that unfortunate word they set the head and the tail of society against themselves" (pp. 389, 397). Undoubtedly the violent and revolutionary condition of France, which requires, inasmuch as it tolerates, such enormous force to prevent collision, is founded primarily on the antagonism between rich and poor, property and labour; and hence the socialist character of the revolution of 1848. But the government of July, and its theorist, Guizot, added to the envy of the rich the hatred of privileges, and increased the natural distinction which separates poverty from wealth, by the artificial protection of capital against aristocracy. It united the two worst qualities of government by a class. Another sign of the unnatural condition of things, and of the contradiction between the tendencies of the king in his later years and his original position on the throne, is touched in a conversation between him and M. Dupin: "The king spoke of his system. *Provided*, he said, *the system is not abandoned*. . . . I answered, As to that, sire, if you mean for ever to impose the same system on all your ministers, it is not worth while to change them. Keep or recal the old ones."

18. Tchadaïef was a Russian politician, who separated himself from the liberal party in 1825 to follow a course of his own, which he illustrated in writings that had a wide circulation in manuscript. In 1836 one of these writings was translated from the original French into Russian, and published in a Moscow review. The Emperor Nicholas thereupon suppressed the review, sent the editor to Siberia, deprived the censor of his functions, and declared the writer to be mad. Tchadaïef was therefore confined to his apartments, and officially visited from time to time by a mad-doctor. During this time he wrote the chief piece of the present collection, the "Madman's Apology."

Peter the Great had striven to put a bottom to the leaky vessel of Russian civilisation, by importing the civilisation of the more advanced countries of Europe. Under Nicholas the reaction against this policy came to the surface, and the Slavists became the dominant thinkers of the country. These men not only reject the artificial varnish with which Peter sought to cover the barbarism of his countrymen, but

they condemn the whole civilisation of Europe, which they maintain to be radically spoiled by Catholicism and the Pope; they think that a purer and more perfect civilisation is wanted, and that its germs may be found in the Eastern Church and the Slave races. Enemies of Catholicism and of Europe, its ideas, manners, and institutions, they attribute all the evils which Russia suffers to the foreign elements which have been introduced into it; and they make its real mission to consist in the logical development of the Eastern Church and the Slavonic nationality.

Tchadaïef, on the other hand, considered that the Slaves had no history and no traditions of their own, and that Peter was quite right in seeking a foundation for Russian progress in the institutions which might be borrowed from the older countries of Europe. He was in favour of a more logical and a more wholesale realisation of the fundamental idea of Peter's policy, which was symbolised by the transfer of the capital from the Oriental Moscow to the European Petersburg; and he considered it to be the only possible remedy for the unhistorical, untraditional, and consequently inconstant, character of his countrymen.

He was no Catholic; but as he admitted that civilisation ought to be one, much more did he admit that the Church ought to be one. We do not find that he directly blamed Peter for not introducing unity with Rome into his scheme for making Russia a European power; but at least he proclaimed aloud that he considered the attraction which had originally drawn Russia to the corrupted and corrupting Byzantium to have been the greatest misfortune which ever happened to the Slaves. These principles did not work out their practical conclusion in his life, but they are followed out without any considerable inconsequence in his writings.

His conclusion seems to have been, that an enlightened despotism was the only government for Russia, because Russia was the only country where a government could do what it liked. "*Il suffit qu'une volonté souveraine se prononce parmi nous pour que toutes les opinions s'effacent, pour que toutes les croyances fléchissent, pour que tous les esprits s'ouvrent à la pensée nouvelle qui leur est offerte.*" The destiny of every other people is that which their history has carved out for them. The Russians have properly no destiny; they may go where they are led. "*Jouissons,*" he cries, "*de l'immense avantage de n'obéir qu'à la voix d'une raison éclairée, d'une volonté réfléchie.*" It does not seem to have occurred to the writer that if, after so many centuries of historical existence, the Slaves have no history and no traditions, the very absence of tradition is their tradition, and it is their destiny to be an unhistorical people,—a great revolutionary power perhaps, but impotent to create for others what they never have been able to create for themselves.

19. Mr. Riethmüller was a contemporary of Frederick Lucas at the London University, and the two fellow-students kept up the friendship of their youth till death parted them. But the intimacy



was one rather of companions than of counsellors; and Mr. Riethmüller was much better acquainted with the general character of his friend than with his particular ideas and intentions, especially those of the latter part of his life. Hence he wisely abstains from giving any account of the position which Lucas occupied among the Catholics of the United Kingdom, or of the various controversies in which he was engaged with the several sections of them.

The value of the present book is in its account of Lucas in his youth and early manhood. He is described as a light-hearted and high-spirited lad; extremely shy, but very handsome; fair, fresh, with broad forehead, light hair, and blue eyes; very stout, broad-shouldered, and broad-chested; with a sweet smile; silent and reserved with strangers, and unable to address a lady without blushing. Like Chaucer's knight, there was a girlish modesty in him, which contrasted with his manliness and courage. He was always able to express himself fluently and forcibly, and from the first he rather indiscriminately devoured books than digested them, and became quite a magazine of multifarious and almost universal information. He liked pictures and music (which he did not understand), and he was passionately fond of the theatre. Like other strong hearty lads, he had no objection to a street-row, and was great in boating, bathing, and cricket, and all athletic sports. His friendships were of the warmest kind, and his speeches at the debating-club racy and very telling. In this club he displayed mental characteristics which his biographer thinks stuck to him through life. He never took up a subject by halves; whatever principle he adopted, he followed out to its extreme consequences, accepting all deductions from it, and holding them with a tenacity, and defending them with a vehemence, which astonished cooler judgments. He adopted in succession many different theories, each of which in its turn was absolute lord of his whole mind. And though his defence of them was saved from being offensive by his good-nature and kindness, his practical moderation and fairness in dealing with others, and his modest estimate of his own worth, these qualifications of his outward bearing could not conceal the tumultuous and fiery emotions which blazed within him, colouring his imagination and mastering his will. What was said with doubtful truth of Burke was evidently true of Lucas,—he formed his opinions like a fanatic, and then defended them like a philosopher.

Originally a Quaker, and brought up in the strict seclusion of that sect till his seventeenth year, Lucas found himself in a new world among the youth of the London University. Then he became at once a strong partisan of Catholic Emancipation, which was the great question of the day, and a fervid admirer of O'Connell. This was rather through his antagonism to Protestant injustice and prejudice, and his belief in the right of free thought and worship, than through any sympathy with Catholics or their religion, or through any deliberate theory of politics. He took a leading share in the party politics of the young college. He was one of the leaders in a seces-

sion which set up an opposition debating-society, and a contributor to two out of three periodicals which the students established,—the *Marauder* and the *London University Chronicle*,—which appear to have been, for the most part, “sad trash.” He had, however, a keener eye for the politics of the great stage of the world; and his biographer notices, as a proof of his early sagacity, “that he foresaw the troubles in France (in 1830) long before the crisis of the Polignac ministry.” On leaving the London University he entered the Middle Temple, and forthwith strove to attain a complete scientific knowledge of the law. This desire led him necessarily to the writers on the philosophy of jurisprudence, among whom Bentham then enjoyed the highest renown with the young men. Lucas was completely fascinated by this writer. He accepted not only his ingenious mechanism of law-reform, but his whole moral and political philosophy. The most unselfish of men became a Utilitarian, and a fanatic for the principle of selfishness. He gave his whole soul to the new idea, and became a sceptic in religion. He read Hobbes and Hume, and the French infidels of the last century. In poetry he was under the spell of Byron, and shared the popular prejudice against Wordsworth. But the natural reaction from Bentham’s cut-and-dry schemes drove him to take a sudden interest in Wordsworth’s poetry, which, almost from the first moment, wrought a complete revolution in his mind, and restored to him those aspirations of a nature in itself devout and reverential from which Bentham’s philosophy had cut him off. To the end of his life he openly professed his spiritual obligations to this great poet. Under the influence of his new inspirations, he sought, with a passionate earnestness, to harmonise the claims of faith and reason. He was first fascinated with Berkeley’s metaphysics; and ever afterwards, when he had ceased to belong to his school, he venerated him as one of the first of English thinkers both for clearness and depth of insight. But Butler’s *Analogy* had a still deeper influence on him; it changed the whole form of his thought, threw his reason into a new mould, and furnished a model of a logical platform and line of argument, which in his subsequent career he “strained to the utmost.”

Lucas was now a believer unattached, and found that the sect in which he had been brought up, with its silent worship and freedom from all dogmatic teaching, was at least a convenient halting-place. It left him comparatively free to believe and do as he chose, and was an excellent camping-ground from which he could survey the several religious bodies which claimed his allegiance. His first essay was probably connected with the acquaintance which he formed with Mr. Thomas Carlyle, whose writings gained an extraordinary influence over his mind. Like Mr. Emerson, and other American disciples of that gentleman, Lucas’s first impulse was to reduce Christianity to a muscular system, and to give an athletic interpretation to its doctrines. Shelley’s speculations were perhaps not without some influence upon him, and he became a Vegetarian. He lived for many months on vegetables alone, and startled the



tavern-waiters by ordering "potatoes for six" for his own dinner. At the same time he adopted other quasi-ascetic practices, partly, no doubt, with a religious intention—such as total abstinence from sleep when engaged in reading, or great bodily exertion after a long course of pursuits entirely sedentary. But this freak did not last more than a year. About this time he became a student of Dante and Göthe, and afterwards turned his attention chiefly to history, and expressed his obligations for the true method of studying it to Lord Macaulay and Mr. Carlyle. The method of the latter had the greater influence over him, and contributed indirectly to his change of creed; for the sympathies which Mr. Carlyle's writings called forth were all against the moderns, and therefore in favour of the Middle Ages; and the remedy to which they pointed for actual social evils was the revival of faith.

That which Mr. Carlyle declared to be a social necessity, though he did not show how it was to be accomplished, was actually being achieved, in a measure, at Oxford. The revival of faith was pronounced to be the want of the age by Mr. Carlyle, and was shown to be a possibility by the Tractarians. While other sects were either bewailing their want of it, or vainly endeavouring to hide its absence by rant and fanaticism, the Oxford movement was seeking and finding its traces in the direction of reverence for the past, and research into ecclesiastical antiquity. Lucas threw his whole mind into the controversy; and the result was what his biographer calls a new change, though in reality it was but a new growth of the reaction from that scepticism which had served to clear off the prejudices of his youth, and to empty the vessel of his mind for the new juice that was to be poured into it, there to ferment and go through its natural changes.

That the changes in Lucas's religious ideas were nothing wayward and accidental, but a normal growth, is proved both by the similarity of his case to that of many others, under outward circumstances but little resembling his, and by the rational and consistent account which may be given of them. From Berkeley he learned to distinguish the world into substance and species, the one consisting of a force akin to that of our souls, the species being the congeries of sensible qualities,—weight, solidity, and the rest, that go to make out our ideas of matter. Having thus unlearned the materialism of modern physics, which places the substance rather in the atom than in the force which upholds the atom, the next step was to investigate the unity of the laws of substance, or, in other words, the similarity of their action in all the spheres of which human science takes cognisance. Butler's Analogy is a typical specimen of this kind of investigation, and has exerted the same influence over hundreds of other persons in the mental position of Lucas as it exercised over him. The next natural step, after the recognition of a Divine Unity continually upholding the various substantial forces which manifest themselves in the phenomena of the universe, is the desire of the religious mind to appropriate to itself more of this force, to com-

municate in its purest manifestations, and to hold aloof from all disturbing elements that could keep the mind at a distance from the true source of rational and moral power. In all ages this has led to a kind of asceticism, which was supposed to have a kind of sacramental power over the substantial part of the man. In early times, when the antagonism between flesh and spirit was more present to the consciousness, this asceticism was a maceration of the body to enlarge the soul. Now when the soul is rather conceived to be the substantial form of the body, a certain development of the body is supposed to be necessary for the development of the soul, and we have muscular Christianity, vegetarian institutes, and a sort of religious water-cure.

At this stage the writings of Mr. Carlyle seem almost a revelation, rather through the peculiarities of his style than through his philosophy; for his personification of abstractions, and his constant show of postponing the visible to the invisible,—the mass to the force, the thing to the feeling, the opinion to the reason that forms it,—makes his language seem the very language of a faith which at the same time acknowledges the science of the nineteenth century; and as such, it has been adopted by other Christian writers besides Lucas, among whom we need only name Dr. Faber, in his three lectures on St. Philip. But the earnest seeker, though he may have to traverse this stage of thought, if he has insight enough soon discovers its inanity, and finds out the difference between a philosophy which would bring down the Christian sacraments to meaningless but verbose generalities, and one which would rise from the correspondences of the inward and outward in nature—of the spheres of matter and spirit—to a conception of the possibility and the need of such divine aids as the Christian sacraments. After this, the search through Christian communities for the Church which dispenses these means of grace can, with the honest and clear-headed man, have but one termination—submission to the Catholic Church.

This growth in Lucas has had its counterpart in many who have followed the same track. That his conversion was to be his final change his friends acknowledged when they tried to dissuade him from the “irrevocable” step. It was only an after-thought when they prophesied that, because he had changed so often, and had so often announced his then actual phase to be his final resting-place, he would yet change again, and leave the Church for some new ideal. For they did not recognise that in the line over which Lucas travelled, the Church is the terminus. The traveller may go back to scepticism, or by branch-lines right or left to some form of superstition or imposture; but that is all. A convert, therefore, like Lucas remains in the Church, not because he is bound with the fetters of “priestcraft,” or overcome by the imposing look of venerable authorities; but because his own reason also tells him that Catholicism is the final term of the series; and that the restless mind, if it is discontented with the true liberty it has gained, must go back to the regions of false liberty which it had already surrendered as



untenable. Lucas's biographer does not understand this, and therefore cannot do complete justice either to the feelings or to the reasons of the convert.

After Lucas's conversion, Mr. Riethmüller still watched his career with the most friendly interest in his success ; but there was no longer that complete community of idea between them which enables one man to understand another's thought, and to become the biographer of his inner life. The Catholic life of the most remarkable Catholic layman whom the present generation has beheld in England has yet to be written.

We say this, not to disparage a charming book, written in a kindly spirit which must gratify all friends of Mr. Lucas, but in order to express a hope that there may be yet some remains forthcoming that will clear up points of his life which Mr. Riethmüller knew nothing about, or knowing took no interest in. The biographer is abundantly conscious that his history of Lucas's early life is the most valuable part of his book, and he apologises for the number of pages which he devotes to this part of his subject. "Those only knew Lucas thoroughly," he says, "who knew him in his youth, before the burden of a great and awful responsibility rested upon him, and when he was yet free to choose his own path, and to follow the quick impulse, or indulge the wayward fancy, without constant reference to the authority of a power which claims an absolute dominion over the souls and consciences of men." Mr. Riethmüller was clearly jealous of a power which seemed to have robbed him of his friend's heart.

His opinion is that Lucas's life was a failure, both in his attempt to "restore the ideas of the twelfth century," and in his Irish policy. But he thinks also that it was a failure more glorious than many a success, because of the virtues which it called forth, and of the motives from which it sprang. It has, he thinks, an objective interest, as being "the story of the recoil of a very powerful mind from the scepticism and presumption of the age," and "of its finding repose amid the shadows that seemed to have passed away for ever." But its great lesson is subjective. "It tells of a lofty heroism ;" of a stainless Paladin, without fear and without reproach ; of a fearless confessor ; of the strong and calm faith of a martyr. "In his high sense of honour and duty, in his dauntless courage, in his entire unselfishness, and complete submission to the will of God, he has left an example for all to follow."

20. Mr. Ruskin's little book expresses his great indignation at the mercantile selfishness which veils its face under the respectable name of Political Economy. No legitimate occupation of mankind, he truly says, is really selfish. It is as much the duty of the true merchant to sacrifice himself, on occasion, to provide for the people, as it is the soldier's to defend, or the priest's to instruct them. The real business of the merchant, when properly understood, is to provide for the community by an exchange of the productions of several countries and climates.

But Mr. Ruskin soon forgets his ideal merchant, and builds his

book on a distinction between political and mercantile economy, which is founded on a totally different conception of the merchant's business. Mercantile economy, he maintains, is the art of establishing the maximum of the inequality of wealth in a man's own favour. To the mercantile mind wealth is not a positive quantity, such as abundance of necessities; but a relative quantity, dependent for its value on the dearth of necessities elsewhere. For money, Mr. Ruskin maintains, is simply a note of hand for so much labour; hence the force of the money in one man's pocket depends on the lack of it in another's; for if the pockets of both were full, neither would work for the other. To be rich where all were rich would secure no service. Riches would be useless to the possessor till other men had become less rich or more poor than he. Therefore the art of getting rich is in another aspect only the art of making or keeping others poor. Of the various ways of accomplishing this, the easiest is by means of ignorance,—a qualification liberally provided for mankind by nature, and easily perfected in them by art. Even in matters of exchange the ignorant are completely at the mercy of the knowing, who can cheat them at their ease. Thus the science of economy includes an art of nescience, by which a meek and yielding subject-matter is provided for the cheating, oppression, lying, deceit, and tyranny of the merchant. But political economy is equal in its beneficence. It has nothing to do with the mercantile gain founded on exchange, nor does it go about to establish a *minus* on one side, in order to create a *plus* on the other. It is the science which teaches nations to desire and labour for the things that lead to life, and to scorn and destroy the things that lead to destruction. Its final object is to get a good method of consumption, and a great quantity of things to consume; to use every thing, and to use it nobly. There is no wealth, says Mr. Ruskin, but life; that country is richest which is fullest of noble and happy human beings. The aim of political economy is to give the maximum of life to every one, or to the greatest possible number of the inhabitants of a country; to see that all men have more food, better lodging and clothing, and better education, than they have at present.

This economy Mr. Ruskin calls political; that is, he makes it the duty of the state to carry it out by a code of law, and by means of schools, workshops, warehouses, and asylums, such as French socialists have dreamed of, which are to be founded and administered by the government. The great laws of human interest and social good-will will never of themselves work out the true principles of this science; for selfishness preponderates in society, and social, as distinct from political, economy, is sure to acquire a mercantile bias, which will tend to establish a social system such as we may see in India, with plethoric usurers at one end of the scale, and beggared workmen and peasants, out of whom the usurers screw their gains, at the other, and no middle class between. Mr. Ruskin appears to imagine that all persons who pursue wealth are agreed that greater gains can be extorted from paupers than can be made by the profits of a brisk trade with a wealthy and much-devouring yeomanry.



Mr. Ruskin is more of a poet than a philosopher, and more of a preacher than either. His book is only tolerable when read as an appeal to the individual conscience. But when he strives to give a scientific value to his rhetorical figures, his generalisations become ridiculous, unless we read them as an elaborate burlesque of those who exclude moral considerations from their practice of economy as completely as he excludes material considerations from his theory. This fundamental fault reflects itself in the style of the book: with all its affected precision and logic, it is a cloudy picturesque jumble of arbitrary analogies and illustrations grotesquely employed as arguments. The style also fails to impress us with any idea of the writer's good faith. It makes us suspect that he would not attempt to found political science on the individual conscience and a kind of ascetic morality, unless he wished to revolutionise both morals and politics—making the one Judaic rather than Christian, and the other bureaucratic and socialistic rather than constitutional.

21. When the details of the recent expedition into the interior of Australia, which will remain one of the most touching and familiar chapters in the history of English adventure, reached the colony of Victoria, the universal sorrow for the fate of the leaders was accompanied by a very general belief that the catastrophe was almost as certainly due to a want of foresight and attention to details on the part of the commander, as the practical success was to his extraordinary energy. The Royal Commission which examined the evidence reported, that "Mr. Burke evinced a far greater amount of zeal than of prudence," and, "it does not appear that Mr. Burke kept any regular journal, or that he gave written instructions to his officers. Had he performed these essential portions of the duties of a leader, many of the calamities of the expedition might have been averted." Finally: "We regret the absence of a systematic plan of operations on the part of the leader." In the hope of mitigating the severity of this judgment, in which the popular voice of the colony concurred, and of vindicating the prudence of a man whose fortitude and intelligence are contested by none, Mr. Jackson, a fellow officer of the brother of Burke, has compiled from public documents a narrative of his expedition. This at least appears the only object of a book in which there is none of that picturesque colouring and dramatic effect which a knowledge of the country, and the examination of the local newspapers and discussions, would supply; a book in which no attempt is made to compare the discoveries of Burke with those of Stuart, and no indications given of the value of both for the future prospects of the continent. The real place of Burke and Wills in the history of Australia will have to be determined, not by an account of what they suffered and achieved, but by explaining the importance of the problem they undertook to solve, and the nature of the solution they obtained.

Mr. Jackson throws the blame, first on those who deserted the exploring party before it encountered danger, and obliged the leader to promote men to the vacant posts who were imperfectly tried

and really unfit. Then he throws the weight of his strongest condemnation on Mr. Wright, who failed to obey the orders he had received, and seems to have quailed before the terrors of the desert, but of whom it can hardly be fair to say that he "knew perfectly well the exact nature of his instructions, and foresaw the disastrous consequences almost certain to ensue, should they be disregarded" (p. 30). Less strong language is used towards Brahé, who, by abandoning the depôt a few hours before the explorers reached it, was the immediate cause of their death. Indeed, it does not appear that Brahé can be reasonably blamed. He remained at his post longer than his orders required, and until he judged that his stock of provisions would barely last until he arrived at the other settlements; and one of his companions was dying of scurvy, and prayed to be removed. Burke, it is true, was more resolute; for when one of his men was sinking under disease, he punished him for shamming, and gave him "a good thrashing" a few weeks before he died. Mr. Jackson has no words of criticism or regret for the fate of Gray, to our minds the most painful episode in this tragic story. The leaders themselves were less hard-hearted, and when their own turn came, they remembered their dead companion. "Poor Gray must have suffered very much at times, when we thought him shamming," writes Wills on the day when they reached the deserted depôt.

The phantom of a great stony desert occupying the whole interior, which has hitherto afflicted the Australian settler, and checked migration, is now dissipated, and the prospect of gradually covering the continent with his herds has caused very natural exultation. "The limits of the stony desert," writes Sir Henry Barkly, "are proved to extend very little farther north than the point to which Sturt penetrated so many years ago; whilst the country beyond is even more adapted for settlement than that which M'Douall Stuart has discovered to the westward of it. . . . Such, in fact is the impression made on the squatters by the accounts received, that the occupation of 'Burke's Land' with stock is already seriously contemplated; and there seems little reason to doubt that, in the course of a few years, the journey from Melbourne to Carpentaria will be performed with comparative facility by passing from station to station." There is probably some exaggeration in these hopes; and the interior, though not uninhabitable, as was feared, is not very inviting. There is no doubt about the scantiness of wood and of water. The beds of the creeks are for the most part dry, whilst in some cases the marshy nature of the banks makes it impossible for cattle to approach them. It is extremely doubtful, therefore, whether the condition of the colony is much altered by the result of the recent exploration.

22. A German Jesuit, who has been for many years a missionary in the United States, has written a book of popular controversy, in which reminiscences of sound study pursued in his own country occasionally appear, but which exhibits so many instances of hasty reasoning and superficial knowledge, that we have no desire to see it used in this country. It gives a low idea of the mental cultivation,



not indeed of the writer, but of the public for which he writes. Some difficulties are met by a bare assertion; some by arguments which would not be accepted by many of the author's brethren; and some by rhetorical figures exceedingly ingenious and amusing, from the strong local colouring they bear. We lately called attention to a Father of the Society in France, who claims the Spanish Inquisition as one of the glories of the Church, and rebukes the weakness of those who have attributed to it a national character and a political tendency. If we compare the language of Dr. Weninger on the same subject, we shall understand how absurd it is to lay at the door of the Order in general the opinions of particular members. According to him (p. 245), "the Spanish Inquisition, so far as it is objectionable, is of purely political origin, and has nothing at all to do with the claims of the Catholic Church." He endeavours to shame the Americans out of their Protestantism by an appeal to their patriotism (p. 102): "You are Protestants to-day because English tyrants forced Protestantism on your ancestors. You have thrown off the political yoke of England, but you have not got rid of her religious influence." The enjoyment of a liberty almost unknown even in the Catholic countries of Europe, and the tone of confident prosperity common in Americans, has sometimes betrayed Catholic writers into language too sanguine and exultant. We hope it is from his American experience that Dr. Weninger is led to the startling prophecy, that "a time will come when all our separated brethren will return to Catholic unity" (p. 335). But we must observe, that the conscription, by driving away thousands of the Irish, and arresting for the future the stream of immigration, injures the prospects of Catholicism in the Northern States. The increase of the power of the State, and its emancipation from popular control introduce a condition of things more suited to the spirit and nature of the Church than an order which was not always free from the perils of anarchy, and never from the capriciousness of unrestricted power. But the increased authority, though undoubtedly a benefit to the country, may become dangerous to liberties which are not popular; and a government based on the denial of the rights of minorities, and no longer checked by the presence of one sufficiently vast and organised, will not always be exempt from those jealousies and suspicions which all governments have displayed in their intercourse with the Holy See. The separation of the Slave States leaves the northern Catholics exposed to the hostility of the fanatical abolitionists, who can hardly sympathise with a Church which is precluded from condemning slavery as absolutely as they do. In a community divided between abolitionists and republicans, the Church will not easily escape political odium, and Catholics will be compelled on religious grounds to connect themselves with one of the parties.

23. The reviews and critical journals which undertake to keep a record of the progress of literature have created a new difficulty in the way of those who desire to trace the currents of contemporary

thought, by diverting a very large amount of intellectual activity from the legitimate domain of critical discussion. It is impossible to follow the advance of knowledge or the vicissitudes of taste and opinion by attending only to those publications which ordinarily fall under the reviewer's notice. In scientific discovery, in literary research, in religious and political inquiries, there is much labour done which does not find its way into the books of the season. The reviews have acquired an original, independent importance, and are occupied with the study not merely of the books, but of the sciences themselves. It has, therefore, become a great desideratum, both in the pursuit of learning and in the study of subjects of the day, to know what is stirring, not only in separate publications, but also in the literary journals of different countries. A review of periodicals is as necessary as a review of books, and it is a far more pressing want; for nothing of the kind has hitherto existed, while reviews of the ordinary kind have multiplied to an enormous extent. No journal could pretend to keep account of all that appears in reviews, or to satisfy at the same time the curiosity of the politician, the historian, the man of science, and the student of religious questions. But it would be important and not very difficult to institute a record of ephemeral literature, which should be complete from any one of these points of view. We have great pleasure in observing, that an attempt is being made to supply this deficiency, so far as Catholic or theological interests are concerned, by two German ecclesiastics, in the *Literary Directory for Catholic Germany*.

The information given by this review, which was begun last winter, and is to appear ten times a year, is as follows. First, there is a carefully selected list of about two hundred of the most important books of the month, in which German and Catholic works have the lion's share; but France and the Netherlands are very well represented. Then come about a score of very compressed critical notices, written with a good knowledge of the subjects treated, and with rare impartiality. This department is followed by several pages of literary and scientific news, from which the reader may glean a good deal of private information respecting recent and approaching publications, some of the arcana of editing and publishing, the prospects of Catholic literature in other countries, and a variety of things generally reputed beneath the dignity of criticism, and which literary men ascertain by dawdling over the counter at their bookseller's, or by breakfasting at each other's houses. Next comes a register of the contents of reviews and of the transactions of learned societies, preceded by a very short account of the principles and character of each journal. More than one hundred periodicals are sent to the editors for this purpose; they have a very extensive correspondence in many different countries. No other review contains so much information in so small a space, or supplies more agreeable reading; and it is incomparably the most complete record of what is going on in literature among Catholics on the Continent.



## CURRENT EVENTS.

**Mr. Cobden's** Review of the State of Parties. THE attempted alliance between the Tories and Economists was frustrated for the session on the 4th of June; but the leader on one side, and most of the leaders on the other, remained equally anxious to

accomplish it; and there was little probability that Parliament would separate without receiving some further indication of the fact. This was afforded by the debate in the House of Commons on the 1st of August. Mr. Cobden had given notice of an intention to review the state of parties, and the conduct of the Administration; and the drift of his speech was to show that Mr. Disraeli, as a less extravagant minister than Lord Palmerston, had greater claims than he to the confidence of the Liberal party, since the principles of the party were three,—economy, non-intervention, and reform; while of these the first alone was an end in itself, the other two being only means to its attainment. The Government, he said, had come in on two grounds; first, that they would give the country a better Reform Bill than that of their predecessors, and next, that they would always keep us on friendly terms with France. The result had been, that they had “kicked reform out of existence altogether,” and that we had had nothing but a cry of invasion from France ever since their accession to office. Hence Lord Palmerston, unable to command an effectual support from the natural allies of his party, was compelled to govern by the help of the opposition; and, while the Tories, therefore, were virtually directing the policy of the country without the responsibilities of office, the Liberal party was being demoralised, and so destroyed for the future.

Mr. Cobden not only holds that his party exists for the sole end of economy, but he also argues as though economy consisted absolutely in not spending money; so that if one government could be shown to have conducted affairs with lower estimates than another, it would follow that, whatever might in either case have been the circumstances of the time, the ministers who spent the least money were the most economical. The extreme crudity of such an argument laid him open to Lord Palmerston's common-sense reply, that economy is the judgment which a sensible man makes of the wants of the moment, and of the best means of satisfying those wants at the least expense, and with the greatest efficiency. But when the Government defend their measures as economical, on the ground that they avert dangers which would be still more expensive, Mr. Cobden and his followers retreat behind an objection which in fact only conceals their real position. The danger, they say, is perfectly chimerical; the last four years have been a time of “profound and growing peace;” the attack against which we are providing, at so heavy a cost, never can be made, and our provision therefore is money thrown away. There is no reason to suppose that they use

this language insincerely; but the root of their policy is not the supposed improbability of the attack, but the small value they set on the things to be defended against it. Mr. Bright has before now pointed his pacific exhortations with a contrast between the social freedom enjoyed under despotic governments and the political freedom in which we live; and Mr. Cobden's subordination of all other public considerations to the desire of diminishing taxation in the aggregate, is by no means a mere accident of the occasion, or a consequence of his individual position. Ordinary Radicalism, so far as it is disaffected to our political system, has traditions and aspirations of its own, and seeks to destroy or remodel the institutions around it in the pursuit of some ideal proper to itself. But Economism has no ultimate political ideal. It aims at getting the functions of the State performed at the cheapest possible rate; and, in order to attain this end, it desires that the State should be the creature of the nation. But it is nearly indifferent between political systems as far apart from each other as those of the United States and of France; so, that if it succeeded to-day in assimilating our institutions to one of these types, it would not be conscious of any great calamity to-morrow, if it found them remodeled on the other.

A reform which would satisfy Mr. Cobden and his friends would in reality be a subversive one; and it was certainly not to effect such an end that the present Government took office. If the Economists had been gifted with political insight in 1859, they would have accepted Lord Derby's Reform Bill, which succeeded in embodying a vigorous democratic principle in forms that were not ungrateful to the Tory party. But they missed the point of the proposed measure, though it was explained with remarkable boldness and lucidity in the most revolutionary speech Lord Stanley has ever made, and they mistook as completely the temper of the nation. The Bill was thrown out; and Mr. Bright made his attempt to inaugurate a social war for purely democratic reform. His aim was to keep the question open till he could close it in a manner entirely satisfactory to his own party. But the movement met with little sympathy among those to whom it specially appealed; and the open avowal of its ulterior aims brought about a reaction, which naturally ended by discrediting reform altogether. The result was, that when Parliament met in 1860, nothing remained of the past agitation but the hustings pledges it had imposed; and how best to get rid of those pledges was the problem which members on both sides of the House immediately set themselves to solve. The Government introduced a Bill which showed either that its framers had not profited by their past experience, or that they were more anxious to carry a measure of some kind than to propose a good one. In the discussions that ensued, there was no party which, as a party, preserved its dignity; but the cause of reform was decisively lost before the opening of that discreditable chapter of our parliamentary history. It was lost by Mr. Bright, almost single-handed, and so completely, that it will be well if the mischievous consequences of the defeat should not last for



years to come. There is no social necessity for reform in England now, as there was thirty years ago; and the attempt to excite a class agitation on the subject deserved to end in failure. But there is a scientific necessity for it, existing independently of popular enthusiasm, and remaining unaffected by popular apathy. Mr. Bright and his friends have succeeded in confusing the two ideas; and the effect of his exaggerated and distorted reasoning must die away before any administration can again undertake the cause of reform with the slightest chance of a useful or practical result.

But whatever blame may attach to the Government with regard to the postponement of a necessary reform, they cannot be justly charged with any tendency to undervalue or endanger the French alliance. There are two views of the ideal nature of our alliance with France—the one embodied in the commercial treaty, the other symbolised by Lord Palmerston's bygone visits to Compiègne, and proclaimed in Mr. Disraeli's recent speeches in the House of Commons. The first is national, the second dynastic. The first is built on a solid foundation of mutual independence and respect; the second is the offspring of vulgar deference and unintelligent suspicion. The commercial treaty represents an alliance which proceeds by the interpenetration of interests spread over the whole field of national life. It is one of the most characteristic achievements of the present Government; and they have upheld it with singular consistency, both in itself and in the measures which naturally surround it and form its complement. It is against one of those measures that Mr. Cobden sets himself when he complains of the expenditure on defensive preparations. Whether the plan of naval and military defence adopted by the Government is better or worse than others which have been proposed is a question apart from that of the expenditure on defensive preparations as such; and if the Admiralty were as incompetent, and the fortifications as likely to be useless, as Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bernal Osborne allege, it would still remain true that the measure of our manifest power of self-defence is also the measure of the ultimate guarantee for those objects to which the commercial treaty is directed. The treaty made peace more profitable; it remained to make war more costly. The two designs run into and complete one another. The fortifications without the treaty might be plausibly regarded as a menace; the treaty without the fortifications would, for years to come, be at the mercy of any adventurer who might happen to wield the forces of France.

Nor was the vigorous conduct of our defensive preparations a matter of choice for any minister who wished to retain the direction of affairs. The course of French history in 1851 convinced the people of this country of the danger of invasion; the incidents of the Crimean War convinced them that they were not prepared to meet it; and, since then, no government has been able to stand, except on condition of associating itself with those measures which the popular apprehension on the subject demands. This necessity, in 1859, overcame the resistance of Lord Derby's government to the

enrolment of the Volunteer force ; for the last three years it has reconciled no small proportion of Lord Palmerston's supporters to a series of measures to which their own convictions were opposed ; and it would exercise an influence not less powerful over the members and supporters of any other ministry that might now succeed to office. Mr. Disraeli, last session, denounced the dominant policy ; but when he had done so, Lord Derby seized the first opportunity of declaring himself in its favour ; and Mr. Disraeli's subsequent modification of his original statement showed clearly on which side were the sympathies of the Tory party, and what would be the programme of a Tory administration. It is obvious that, as a minister, he would have no power to impose his own views on hostile colleagues, or to carry them out in the teeth of discontented and suspicious followers. The subject is one on which, as far as his own side of the House is concerned, he stands almost alone ; and his position with regard to it is the more significant because it illustrates the general causes which separate him from the trust and obedience of his party.

And it is this separation which in reality supplies the key to those abnormal relations of public men which scandalise Mr. Cobden. Lord Palmerston governs with the support of the Tories, not because he carries out their policy, but because their distrust of their own leader is greater than their sense of party obligation, or their antipathy to the cause of their opponents. The bulk of the Conservative members in 1846 regarded Peel's free-trade measures as a departure from the principles on which he had formed, and, up to that time, led their party ; and their notion in deserting him was to maintain the continuity of the party tradition which they considered him to have abandoned. But Mr. Disraeli was an avowed enemy to that tradition. His point of sympathy with those who desired to uphold it was the merely negative and transient one of antagonism to Peel ; and when he became their leader, it was with the declared aim of remodeling the principles of the party. His design was to get rid of Conservatism altogether, and to substitute for it a new tradition, based on the idea of an essential alliance between the extremes of political thought. He proposed to found or restore a Toryism which should have no jealousy of popular franchises,—a Radicalism which should find its strongest support in a substantial prerogative and a free aristocracy. This idea was developed in his early writings ; and, though time and experience may have modified the application of his principles, he has always consistently adhered to it. But he has not succeeded in transforming the party he leads ; and, as they have gradually perceived the principle which animates his policy, they have become more and more estranged from him both in opinion and sympathy, until at last the great body of them seem to have reached the point of preferring to remain in opposition rather than see him in power.

No doubt this feeling would be less strong, and the practical expression of it would perhaps be checked altogether, if the head of the actual government were himself unpopular among his oppo-



nents. But, so far as Lord Palmerston himself attracts their support, it is at least as much by his personal qualities as by any supposed compromise with them in his policy. He has never been a typical Whig, and, he has never shown the slightest sympathy with Radicalism ; and so far he has points of negative agreement with the Tories, which other statesmen in his place might not have. But these are no new developments in his mind, nor have they now for the first time begun to affect the character of his administration. Mr. Cobden and his friends have seen them in operation before ; and when they concurred in the motion which brought Lord Derby's ministry to an end, they ought to have foreseen the results of which they now complain so bitterly. The policy of Lord Palmerston's second administration has been the same as the policy of his first, with this difference,—that it has been greatly modified by the influences of which Mr. Gladstone may be taken as the representative. In political science those influences are adverse to Mr. Cobden's views : in economical legislation, they are in his favour ; in both, they stamp the Government with a mark of more decided and essential antagonism to the principles of the Tory party.

**The Catholic  
University  
in Ireland.**

On the 5th of July, a deputation of members of Parliament, and of representatives of various corporate towns in Ireland, waited upon Lord Palmerston, with memorials praying that the Crown would grant a charter to the Irish Catholic University. Every town in Ireland of the least importance petitioned through its corporate body. Twenty members of Parliament attended, together with the mayors of the chief cities. They urged upon the Premier very forcibly the right of the Catholics of Ireland to educate their children according to their consciences; their right to found a collegiate institution which would give Catholic education, in the same sense in which the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin give Protestant education ; and their further right to have the institution so founded not laid under the ban of the State by being refused the power to grant degrees, and being thus denied the privileges possessed by other Universities in the access to professions. Lord Palmerston's answer was so thoroughly characteristic, that it might almost have been sketched beforehand. He began with a joke; and then professed his respect for a body so respectable as the Catholics, and his surprise at their dreaming of State sanction for an institution founded on "denominational education." Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, academies which are thoroughly denominational in all their fundamental principles, were cited to him in vain. They are ancient foundations, he urged; and besides, they are not now quite exclusive—they admit Dissenters and Roman Catholics. So, it was replied, will the Catholic University admit Protestants, if they choose to come to it; as some, in fact, have come. It is Catholic, not because it shuts its doors upon Protestants, but because the general body of its teaching upon subjects which have affinity with religion is in harmony with Catholic

doctrine, just as the body of teaching in the three Universities above mentioned is in harmony with Protestant doctrine. Catholics, like the majority of Protestants, believe that the higher moral and philosophical education, when divorced from religion, is pregnant with danger; and this being so, they cannot in justice be denied the right which Protestants enjoy, of having a University in which religious teaching forms an essential element in the general education of the place. We deny you no right, rejoins Lord Palmerston; you are free to found any institution you like, and to send your children there; but you must not ask the State to sanction by its charter that system of separate education which it dislikes. The evasion of the real force of the demand is obvious. The State *does* deny the right to found an institution, when it says that the institution so founded shall be denied civil privileges which other similar institutions enjoy; and the Government is not really opposed to denominational education in any case, except the single one of Catholics.

Lord Palmerston's refusal to grant a charter to the University was followed by a demonstration of the Catholics in its favour. The ceremony of laying the first stone of the new building took place on the 21st of July. The attendance of the organised trades of Dublin, a numerous and imposing body, as well as the religious ceremonies, gave considerable prominence to the affair. It has been urged that this popular demonstration, and the agitation which it foreshadows, are rather incongruous modes of inaugurating a high school of learning, and that several conspicuous persons and functionaries refused to be present on the occasion. It may be so, but who is to blame? The Catholic University was founded in 1854, without the least excitement or parade, having at its head a man of genius and a scholar, who surrounded himself with a staff of professors, most of them laymen, and all of them men of cultivation and attainments. On the part of Trinity College there was no repugnance manifested to the new institution, but, if any thing, a spirit of cordiality; and if it had not been for the necessity of obtaining from the State the power of granting degrees, the University would have tranquilly worked its own way forward. But, in the present unhappy condition of the relations between England and Ireland, every act of justice to Ireland has to be extorted in defiance of popular prejudices in this country; so that things that in their nature would seek retirement have to be made the subject of clamour on the highways. There is danger, no doubt, of the Catholic University becoming vulgarised into a cry, and losing in that process much of its finer elements; but this it seems now impossible to avoid. The concession of a charter must eventually be made, but it seems likely to be made late and grudgingly; and if so, it will of course be received with entire thanklessness. The course taken by Government is in singular contradiction to sound political principles. A Tory naturally desires the denominational system to be maintained, for the sake of the Established Church, or at least in order to preserve the influence of religion. A Radical may condemn on principle every exception to the voluntary



system. But a liberal party can be interested only in protecting each portion of the community from the compulsory imposition of any system which it dislikes. A liberal statesman who is exclusively tolerant of either scheme of education, becomes *ipso facto* something else than a Liberal.

There were at the Irish assizes four capital convictions for murder,—those of Herdman in Belfast, **Agrarian Crime in Munster.** Foley in Tralee, Burke in Clonmel, and Walsh, one of the murderers of Mr. Fitzgerald, in Limerick. Walsh and Burke have alone been executed, the sentences having been commuted in the two other cases. Only one case out of the four (Walsh's) was a case of agrarian crime. But while the assizes were actually going on, and on the day when Walsh was on his trial, the most daring agrarian murder within memory was perpetrated—the murder by Hayes of Mr. Braddell, Colonel Hare's agent. It seems that there had been old relations between Braddell and Hayes, the latter having acted in former times as bailiff or driver on the estate. But a feeling of bitter hostility had grown up between them, and at the Limerick Spring Assizes the civil and criminal courts were almost at the same point of time engaged in trying two cases arising out of their contentions. One was an ejectment by Colonel Hare against Hayes, in which the former was defeated, with a very general feeling as to the hardness of the procedure. The other was the trial of the son of Hayes for the murder of the tenant to whom his father's farm was to be given. He was acquitted, upon some doubt as to his identification, though there seemed little doubt of his guilt; and this acquittal was in a great degree an incentive to much of the bloody work which marked the summer. Mr. Braddell had, it appears, got Hayes to sign a paper offering to pay for the land any rent which he (Mr. Braddell) might choose to name, and then raised the rent very considerably. On the 30th of July, he was sitting in the room of the hotel where he was employed in receiving the rents of the estate, when Hayes came in and tendered to him the old rent, which Mr. Braddell peremptorily refused. Hayes (who is a man of at least seventy years of age) then drew out a pistol and shot him through the body. The most wonderful circumstance is that, although there were two men in the room at the time, Hayes succeeded in effecting his escape; and to this hour, notwithstanding the most strenuous and persevering efforts of the police all through the country, he has completely baffled pursuit. It is certainly a wonderful story, and testifies to a great freemasonry among the peasantry in favour of criminals of that class. The aspect of the case is very serious, and assassination can in no way be palliated or tampered with; but to accuse the Irish of sympathy with murder in general, on the strength of occurrences of this kind, shows a want either of discrimination or of candour. In the three cases of non-agrarian murder tried at the Lent Assizes, the people were not with but against the criminal. With agrarian murders, unhappily, they do sympathise,

because the conviction is rooted in their minds that their chief security for holding their land, which is their life, is by frightening the landlords from dispossessing them; and thus they enact that terror shall be the order of the day. But it is important to remember, that these sympathies are exhibited in one district of the island only.

The Minis.  
terial Crisis in  
Prussia.

The crisis which has just arrived in the contest between the Crown and the Parliament in Prussia bears signal traces of the incomplete development of the constitutional system, and of the imperfect maturity of political judgment. The Liberal party broke down at the moment of its triumph in 1848 and 1849, because in its attachment to its doctrines it overlooked the force of existing circumstances, and because of the revolutionary vehemence of the demagogues and of the masses which they controlled. The philosophers undertook to realise the dream of a Prussian empire for which all the conditions and materials were wanting in Germany, and the leaders of the mob caused the middle class to tremble for its own safety, and for the preservation of the social order. The unpractical spirit of the theorists of the party, and the violence of its active managers, led to a powerful reaction, similar in character, though inferior in strength, to that which in France sustains the despotism of Napoleon, and which upheld in Austria during ten years the oppressive bureaucracy of Bach. But in Prussia the reaction was distinguished by a tone of elevated morality, by a reference to the most sacred interests of society, and by a really chivalrous attachment to the throne. These feelings, though degenerating sometimes into servility, intolerance, or hypocrisy, preserved the reaction from the materialism and irreligion which in other countries have been the chief support of the victorious monarchy. Thus it happened that the Manteuffel ministry, which followed the administration of Radowitz and carried out the reactionary policy, retained for several years considerable popularity. If there had been a statesman in office equal to the task of converting the popular desire for peace and for a strengthened authority into a means of securing liberty on the ancient foundation of self-government, by measures which could not then be regarded as a concession to the revolutionary spirit, Prussia might have obtained a sound constitutional system. But it is not easy for a minister to foster freedom when the people are eager to strengthen the sovereign power. The Manteuffel administration took advantage of this eagerness to emancipate itself permanently from the control of opinion by increasing the power and the action of the police. The men and the means that were employed degraded the government and outraged the conscience and the feelings of the people. Those whose conduct in 1848 exposed them to suspicion were persecuted in an underhand and provoking way, and the liberty of the press was illegally undermined. Whilst the supporters of government spoke much of the liberties of Teutonic Christendom, a system was introduced which, in imitation



of the government of French prefects, suppressed all spontaneous movement in the State, and left the efficient power in the hands of the police. In particular, although the independence of the Catholic Church was guaranteed by the 15th Article of the Constitution, it was not more respected by the administration than the liberty of the press; and in the Catholic provinces Protestant proselytism was carried on by all the means at the command of the State. At a time when all the liberal feeling that was not democratic was hushed by the reactionary movement, the treatment of the Church called into existence a party which, under the name of the Catholic Fraktion, took the lead during six years in upholding the principles of right and freedom. It consisted of from sixty to seventy deputies, while the Liberals of the French School hardly numbered thirty, and the democratic element was not represented in the Chamber.

The Manteuffel ministry lost the confidence of the heir to the throne by the same disingenuous and illiberal policy which gradually converted the good-will of the majority of the people into the most violent hostility. At Coblenz the Prince occupied the same palace as the President of the Rhenish Provinces, Herr von Kleist-Retzow, a Pomeranian nobleman of high character and firm principles, just, straightforward, and candid, but stubborn and uncompromising in the extreme. They were not on good terms with each other. The Prince saw distinctly the evil effects of a severe bureaucratic system, carried out by means of the police, and accompanied by an imprudent proselytism, in provinces so remote from the capital, so entirely disconnected with the real Prussian people, and so earnestly Catholic. He saw that the allegiance of the people would soon be in peril, and he used every effort to obtain an alteration in the spirit of the administration. But Herr von Kleist-Retzow was in great favour with the ministry, and his father-in-law, Count Stollberg-Wernigerode, enjoyed the confidence of the King. He was strong enough to defy the opposition of the Crown Prince. When the King's illness made it probable that his brother would soon be called to the throne, the stern administrator, who had yielded nothing to popular feeling, changed nothing in his conduct to obtain the favour of a political opponent who was likely to be soon his king. It is to his experience at Coblenz that the sympathy of the present King with the moderate Liberals is due. His disgust at the Tory government of the Rhine Provinces overcame the dislike which was natural in his purely military character to the constitutional system. Thus he was driven by the monarchical party into the camp of the Liberals. Nevertheless he did not immediately renounce the policy which was supported by the example of his brother and the traditions of the kingdom. He announced in his programme of the 8th of November 1858, that "there was to be no question of a breach with the past;" that "exaggerated ideas should be met by a prudent and legal, but, if necessary, an energetic, conduct;" that "truthfulness, legality, and consistency should mark all the acts of the government;" and that "the world should learn that Prussia is ready to protect

the right on every occasion." In agreement with this conciliatory announcement, his first ministry was so composed that the remnants of the last almost evenly balanced the new element, which consisted of Count Schwerin, Von Auerswald, and Patow. In the new parliament there was an overwhelming Liberal majority, led by Herr von Vincke. The tactics of this party, at first, were not to press the government, but to obtain a gradual progress in a Liberal direction. But the arrogant and impatient character of the Liberal leader soon overthrew this policy. He insisted on the necessity of weeding the higher class of functionaries, and he led a powerful attack against the chief of the police of Berlin, Herr von Zedlitz, an aristocratic Conservative of the school of the *Kreuzzeitung*, who made regular oral reports to the Prince which could not be controlled by his official superior, the Minister of the Interior. It was considered essential to remove this reactionary influence from the ear of the Regent, and to surround him with a liberal atmosphere. At the same time an attempt was made to supplant General von Manteuffel, brother of the late minister, who was at the head of the military cabinet, and who therefore possessed great influence over that department which was the chosen domain of the new sovereign. These personal attacks, supported by a highly-excited public opinion, soon made King William believe that the Liberal party designed to reduce his crown to a shadow, and to a mere symbol of royalty, and in particular that they wished to deprive him of the control of military affairs. The Liberal patron of the cabinet was consequently paralysed.

The questions of German hegemony and foreign policy greatly widened this breach. From the days of the Frankfort Parliament, it was a dogma of the Gotha Liberals that Prussia had a right to the supremacy in Germany. The subsequent defeat of the scheme of annexation only strengthened this feeling, and the example of Sardinia awakened the belief that the time had come when it was only necessary to act, and when a bold stroke must inevitably succeed. In order to bring about this result, the Hessian difficulty was kept up, the Holstein question was revived, the Diet was reviled in every possible way, and the recognition of the kingdom of Italy was demanded, together with a closer approach to France. These were also the objects of the *Nationalverein*, which was composed of materials the most diverse, and not always the most pure, and was intended as a lever to move the masses. King William, guided by his sense of honour and his principles of legitimacy, showed no disposition to imitate Victor Emanuel, and to take the revolution into his service, only to become its instrument soon after. In the ministry there was no statesman so ambitious or unscrupulous as Cavour, no man who was prepared for a *coup-d'état* or a civil war in Germany. But though none would go so far as this, they were not resolute enough to renounce the alliance of the Hegemonists. From time to time they secretly encouraged the *Nationalverein*, they sought to harass and discredit the Diet, they remained on good terms



with the Cabinet of Turin, and carefully kept a door open for all contingencies, by which, in case of need, there might be an escape into the camp of the German revolution. But these half-measures contented nobody; and the ministers were in favour neither with the Conservatives, nor with the Gotha party, nor with the party of Progress. The same double-dealing was displayed in religious matters by the minister for religious affairs, Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, who had always encouraged proselytism, and sought to circumscribe as much as possible the independence of the Church. It was due to him chiefly that the influence of Prussia was used in other German states, and especially in Baden, to deprive Catholicism of its liberties, and subject it entirely to the bureaucratic system. The King himself is destitute of intolerance; and the notion that Prussia is a Protestant state, or the Hohenzollerns a Protestant house, would never be allowed to cast a shadow between the crown and its Catholic subjects. An open and almost ostentatious sympathy for Catholicism has been shown at court. The symbols of Catholic worship were placed on the altar, where the late King had allowed only a cross. Among the ceremonies which followed the coronation, was the opening of a Catholic Church at Berlin, at which the royal family attended. Many years spent among the Catholic population of the Rhine have not been without influence, and the spirit has been greatly changed since the impiety of one reign disappeared only to make way for proselytism in the next. But public opinion is far behind the throne in tolerance, and the propagandism of the Protestant statesmen is a productive source of danger and of discontent. Gelzer's *Monthly Journal for Protestant Theology*, a Review inspired by Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, openly proclaimed the necessity of restricting the Church by means of the police, of arresting the expansion of religious orders, and of expelling the Jesuits, who are largely recruited from the Catholic provinces of Prussia.

The hopes and the fears which the unprincipled conduct of the government excited served alike to disturb its foundation. It injured itself most of all by its policy respecting the organisation of the army. As members of opposition, the ministers Von Patow and Schwerin had insisted on the reduction of the military expenditure, as greatly exceeding the resources of the land. As ministers they consented to a plan of military organisation which would have cost at least 12,000,000 thalers more. This measure was based on the idea that the *Landwehr* ought to be given up, as it had not answered when the army had been mobilised, and as the summoning of so many heads of families and men of business disturbed the whole social system and caused a general agitation. It was therefore proposed to increase the regular army, at an expense of 9,500,000 thalers, from 45 to 81 regiments of infantry, and from 38 to 56 of cavalry. Thrice in ten years the army had been uselessly raised to a war-footing with a waste of more than 50,000,000 thalers. The *Landwehr* still retained its popularity as a national army from

the time of the War of Deliverance; and the scheme for superseding it could be used by the economical democrats as a powerful instrument to act on the masses. They promised the people not only freedom, but cheaper government, and the reduction of the military estimates. With this cry the party of Progress succeeded at the elections of 1861 in defeating the old Liberals, who, in order not to break with the ministry of the new era, were prepared to concede its demands. When, therefore, the session opened in January, the Left immediately attacked the army estimates, and demanded a more full and detailed specification of the several votes, in order to subject them in detail to a searching criticism. The government did not deny the justice of this claim; but declared it was too late to satisfy it in that session. The resolution of the deputy Hagen required the ministry immediately to present the necessary details; and the democratic majority supported the resolution for the purpose of overthrowing the administration. Most of the ministers, Count Schwerin and Herr von Patow among the rest, considered this a vote of want of confidence. They resigned, and parliament was dissolved.

The new ministers placed themselves from the beginning in a false position. They pledged themselves to the King to carry the expensive but important measure of army reform; but they wished to keep in reserve the *Nationalverein* and the democrats, in order that they might, by their help, seize any opportunity that time might bring of establishing the Prussian empire over Germany. As in the Italian war, they wished to await a favourable occasion to dictate laws to Austria, whilst the loyal and honourable character of the King made it impossible openly to profess the policy of Frederick II. or of Victor Emanuel. The ministry was composed of bureaucrats, with a slight leaning to the *Kreuzzeitung*. Two of the former ministers remained in office: General von Roon, the Minister of War, who had never coquetted with the *Nationalverein*; and the Minister of Commerce, afterwards of Finance, Von der Heydt, an able but not high-principled man, singularly competent and active in his own department. In order to influence the elections, they surrendered a portion of the sums voted by the late parliament for military purposes, and gave promise of further reduction. Their electoral circulars unwisely put forward the person of the King, and identified him with the ministry of the day. Their concessions gave strength to their enemies. The democrats claimed the merit of having obtained them, and the claim was not unjust. They represented the further reductions as dependent on their success, and stated that if they were returned in a majority they would carry a still larger measure of economy. In this way they obtained a large majority in the Chamber, which met on the 6th of May. The old Liberals had undergone a severe defeat. Herr von Vincke had carried his election by only two votes in a rotten borough of Pomerania. He led a party of scarcely twenty members, among whom were the late ministers Schwerin and Patow. The Liberal-Conservative faction of the Catholics was also weaker by about twenty members.



The party of Progress desired to temporise, and only wished to shake the ministry at first by a hostile vote. Although there was no speech from the throne, they moved and carried an address, which was ungraciously received by the King. It is the misfortune of this party to be destitute of eminent statesmen; indeed, it is remarkable, that a country so renowned for intellectual power in every branch of knowledge as Prussia, should have brought forth so little political talent. Great thinkers, and even great political writers, fail in public life; and Prussian politics are more distinguished by the sense and moderation of the people than by the statesmanlike capacity of the principal men. Among the Conservatives, the old Liberals, and the Catholics, this want is, however, less apparent than in the party which is supreme in the present parliament. Many of its members are uneasy from the recollection of the events of 1848, in which they were compromised, and of which the books of the police preserve an indelible record. They are, moreover, divided into *Grossdeutsch* and *Kleindeutsch*, partisans of German unity with or without Austria; and they know that their democratic allies in the other states, especially in Bavaria, Wirtemberg, Saxony, and Hanover, are not eager for the establishment of a Prussian supremacy. They waited, therefore, for an opportunity for action. They hoped that Holstein, or Italy, or Hesse, would bring about a conflict between Austria and Prussia, in which all the German Liberals would be compelled to join them; meantime, they kept up public attention by pointing to the coming debate on the army. The ministry, in like manner, waited on Providence; and having no party in the Chamber, relied on the expectation of active interference in the German question to recover the sympathies of the party of Progress. Count Bernstorff, also a member of the previous cabinet, repeatedly announced the intention of promoting a smaller confederation to the exclusion of Austria. He reckoned in this policy on the support of the Queen and of the Prince of Prussia; and he was encouraged by the two foremost of the Prussian diplomatists, the minister at Paris, Herr von Bismarck-Schönhausen, and the minister at Frankfort, Herr von Usedom. The former secretary of Prince Albert, Herr Mayer, now secretary to the Queen of Prussia, is an influential leader of this party. Professor Duncker, of Halle, now employed to report on public affairs to the Prince of Prussia, is another. The Gotha party is formed chiefly of professors and high functionaries, who have much to gain by a wider sphere of action and a greater field for promotion.

One measure, adopted for the purpose of defying Austria and conciliating the party of Progress and the Emperor Napoleon, was the recognition of the kingdom of Italy. In his reply to the notification of this event, Count Rechberg alluded to the notorious fact, that it was wrung from the King as a means of preserving his ministry. The Emperor of Austria thanked him for having so long resisted the pressure that was used against his resolution, and intimated that the securities which had been demanded in return from the Italian government were nothing but an empty form. A measure of far greater

importance, and a more subtle blow at Austria, was the treaty of commerce with France, which was signed on the 2d of August. To France this treaty was almost a necessity, after the treaty with England. To the Zollverein it is an immense advantage. But it was so manifestly used for political, and even party, purposes, that an opposition was awakened against it among those who fear the ambition and the artifices of Prussia. It was intended to knit more closely the bonds between Prussia and the smaller states, and to exclude Austria from the benefit of the treaty. It was in the power of the Austrian government to obtain these advantages, and to convert the measure into a signal defeat of the Prussian policy. They might at once have declared that they adopted the French treaty, and were ready to join in it. Prussia would thus have lost not only the new weapon of exclusion she was forging, but even the old influences she possessed through the Zollverein. But Austria feared the rough cures of political economy, and trembled at her own financial difficulties. She asked, indeed, to be admitted, but she exacted conditions which Prussia was justified in refusing. In Southern Germany, the fear of Prussia and the hatred of France prevailed over the considerations of national interest, and the treaty was rejected. The Catholic Fraction in parliament alone stood forward to denounce the inconsistency of the recognition of Italy with the declarations of the King and his ministers, and to point out the perfidy of the political schemes which were mixed up with the French treaty. In the former of these debates the whole Conservative party, without any confessional differences, stood by the eloquent Catholic orator August Reichensperger.

The liberal conservative opinion of the country is in favour of an alliance with England and Austria, against the Northern and the Western despotism. In conjunction with Austria, they deem it possible to reform the federal system; and they hold the alliance of England a necessary security to prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world. Against these ideas the old traditions of Prussia bear with overwhelming force. France and the democratic party promise the annexation of Germany, and to gain their aid the Austrian alliance must be thrown off. The apostle of this view is Herr von Bismarck-Schönhausen. He has always dreamed of a league with France and Russia, and he has submitted to the King the plan of a policy founded upon it. This scheme was kept in reserve as a last refuge, by which the Democrats could be won over, and the unity of Germany consummated at the price of the territories beyond the Rhine.

The question of the military organisation, which decided the fate of the ministry, was not debated till the middle of September. The superficial question under discussion turned on the continuation or discontinuance of the measures by which the standing army has been remodeled and increased, at a considerable additional expense, and without the definitive consent of parliament. Although the difference in the expenditure is near two millions sterling, the expense



is not the principal cause of the opposition. From the first, the speakers and journals of the Gotha party have declared that they were ready to vote for larger supplies, if the government would act with vigour in Germany. The party of Progress, which has outstripped the Gotha politicians, endeavours by the attack on the army estimates to influence not only the foreign but the internal policy of the country. They aim less at diminishing the quantity than at altering the quality and composition of the Prussian army. They desire to replace the corporate exclusiveness of the royal service by a popular parliamentary army, and they are therefore opposed to the maintenance of the military tribunals and to the training of officers as cadets. They wish to destroy the army as an instrument and support of the royal authority, and to introduce a volunteer national guard, which would convert Prussia from a military into a democratic state. Public opinion so far supports this policy as it desires relief from taxation, and as the army has lost caste by the three occasions on which it has been placed on a war footing. The officers, moreover, are generally taken from the lesser nobility, which, by its pride and exclusiveness, has become an object of horror to the middle class.

The debate began on the 11th of September. The government had already spent money on the reorganisation of the army before the supplies were voted. This is legal in Prussia, by the 109th Article of the Constitution, and it has been the practice of the Liberal governments. But the ministers, assuming that the reorganisation would not be rejected, had spent extraordinary sums which had been only granted for one year in the former budget. This formed the strength of the opposition. The majority of the committee on the army estimates reported in favour of a reduction to the amount of 6,133,361 thalers, and the Democrats supported the report for the purpose of expelling the ministry from power. Herr Waldeck, their leader, declared that the *Landwehr* ought to be preserved and extended, because it is the people in arms, the bulwark of the constitution, and in evil times a substitute for the constitution. He vehemently attacked the officers of the army. They are, he said, not only the obedient tools of the crown by their very position, but enemies of the constitution as members of the class to which they belong. To increase their numbers is to multiply the enemies of popular rights. Evidently, in the mind of the democratic orator, it is more important to throw the whole power of the State into the hands of the people and to subvert the monarchy, than to extend the power of Prussia in Germany. His speech is illustrated by the language of another democratic notability, Herr Kirchmann. The military question, he declared, would for the first time prove where the supreme decision of great questions resides in Prussia. It is nonsense to speak of a balance of equal powers. The question is, where is the supreme power. Hitherto it has rested in the crown. The moment has arrived to vindicate it for the people. It is of no great consequence what the government will do. The victory must remain with the power which is in the people. But the more moderate Liberals who have coalesced

with the Democrats on this occasion do not lose sight of the greater object. Their views were expressed in this debate by Professor Duncker. The *Landwehr*, he said, saved Prussia in 1813, after the regular army had lost it in 1806. One is the army of the people; the other of the aristocracy. The nobles, by their exclusive Prussian patriotism, are separated from the rest of Germany and are an obstacle in the way of union. But the *Landwehr* is a popular institution, a bond of union, not a barrier between Prussia and Germany; a basis for the amalgamation of the whole military force of the German nation, on which all the Germans would be willing to unite. The substance of this argument is, that the military force of the crown may excite apprehensions among the people of the smaller states, whilst the more popular institution would be a security to all that by annexation to Prussia their liberties would incur no risk. Whilst the Democrats were ready to sacrifice the supremacy of Prussia in Germany to the victory of democracy in Prussia, and the moderates of the party of Progress thought that they could combine the two, the real Gotha party, the most ardent partisans of German unity, wished that all internal reforms should be sacrificed to that great object. This was the signification of the Stavenhagen amendment, proposed by the minority of the committee, and defended in parliament chiefly by Herr von Vincke, Herr von Twesten, and the celebrated historian Sybel. They proposed a reduction of the estimates from 41,000,000 thalers to 36,500,000, by which the reorganisation of the army was not to be interrupted, but the term of service would be reduced from three years to two. The speech of Professor Sybel is the most characteristic of all that were made in this debate. "The complaints of an exclusive spirit among the officers of the army do not apply. Let the peaceful citizens answer pride by pride. The real evil is, that in the last few years the army has assumed a political colour. The army exists for war. Like every other institution in the State, it can have no party attitude. It is in contradiction now with the political sentiment of the majority of the people. 'Germany' is a word it does not willingly hear. This is what has coloured the deliberations of the committee, and caused it to appear that the report says that the chance of war must by every means be avoided, as if the government was particularly warlike and ambitious. That is not one of the faults of our government. It has allowed the sword to grow rusty since 1815, and these stains of rust degrade the sword in the eyes of the people. The *Landwehr* was organised soon after a great catastrophe with the elements, and especially the officers, of a great army. What it wants therefore is the formation of a body of officers as large and as highly educated as possible. . . . The political circumstances of the present day will not allow us to disarm. The position of Prussia in Germany, her supremacy, depends on her armaments. It is only if we convince the world that we are armed and prepared for war that the regeneration of our great united Fatherland can ever come to pass."

The Catholic Fraction in the Chamber was not guided by fac-



tious or ambitious designs, like the several fractions of the Liberal party, and it alone took a constitutional course. Herr Reichen-sperger moved an amendment that the ministers should be compelled to demand an indemnity in parliament for the sums they had expended on their own responsibility. "Although," he said, "I do not think that the complaints of the opposition are unfounded, yet I consider their proposals impolitic. My amendment aims at reconciling the existing differences, and at the same time deciding an important constitutional principle. The position of the Liberal party is formally and materially justified, for the government has no right to consider the reorganisation of the army as already decided on. Supplies were voted in 1860 for a temporary prolongation of the war footing, but there could be no question of a permanent war footing. It is the duty of the House to assert the opinion of the country, and to examine the partial measures of the government." The motion was negatived by a large majority; but it possesses no little interest in our eyes, as it shows the Catholics of Prussia acting in a body for the cause of the constitution, against the Prussian Tories on one side, and the Democrats on the other. The Catholics throughout Germany acknowledge the same principles. Whilst the debate on the military budget was going on at Berlin, the assembly of the Catholic associations was held at Aix-la-Chapelle. After expressing their attachment to the rights and the freedom of the Holy See, they adopted the following resolutions: "The Catholic Church is no support of despotism, and no enemy of political liberty and independence. Now, as in all other ages, she rejects all arbitrary government, whether exercised by princes, parliaments, or parties. The Catholics are not opposed to political progress. They rejoice at all political reforms which advance the welfare of nations, but they conscientiously condemn every breach of law, and abhor the revolution, whether it is founded on universal suffrage, or on the principle of nationality, or on the so-called principle of the accomplished fact. . . . The Catholics assembled in the old imperial city, on the borders of the German territory, declare every attempt to divide Germany in favour either of a German or a foreign power to be a crime. They protest against the exclusion from Germany of the Catholic Imperial House, and abominate every concession to foreign ambition."

The efforts of the Catholics and the Conservatives to save the ministry were unavailing. On the 16th of September the government was defeated on the first vote, by a majority of 273 to 68. The King was unwilling that his ministers should resign. He had allowed them to threaten the House with extreme measures, and he might have governed for a year without a parliament, until new elections sent deputies to Berlin, who would be ready to compromise the question of military organisation. For there was one concession which the government could make without sacrificing any thing essential to its policy. The reduction of the term of service from three years to two would leave intact the whole framework of the new military system, and would gain the support of all those who followed Vincke or Sybel. But that concession could not be imme-

diately made without disturbing the whole military system ; and if made, it could not disarm an opposition which cared not for reforms, but for the destruction of a Conservative ministry. Two courses remained open to the King ; he might either throw himself into the arms of the strictly Conservative and monarchical party of the *Kreuzzeitung*, and place its leaders, the President Von Gerlach and Herr Wagener, at the head of affairs ; or he might take refuge in the popular policy of annexation, and speculate on the movement of German unity and the support of the *Nationalverein*, by calling Herr von Bismarck-Schönhausen into the ministry. The former step recommended itself to a monarch desirous of increasing his own personal authority, for the *Kreuzzeitung* declared on the 14th of September, that "the King possesses indefeasibly all rights which he did not explicitly renounce when he gave the Constitution." The other was the step urged upon him by the royal family, and it was certain to lead to a policy of aggrandisement, which thousands out of Prussia desired, and which would be in harmony with the traditions of the monarchy. King William was so unwilling to embrace either alternative, that the ministers resolved, on the 17th, to attempt conciliation by accepting the Stavenhagen amendment. This measure was coldly received. The opposition desired no concession that could save the government, and the committee subjected the Minister of War to so searching an examination, and elicited in his answers so many objections to an immediate reduction of the term of service, so many technical difficulties, and so strong a case against the economy of the plan, that they refused to be contented. On the 20th, Herr von Bismarck arrived from Paris, and was placed at the head of the administration, from which Prince Hohenlohe, Count Bernstorff, and Herr von der Heydt retired.

We may gather the importance of this great crisis, the gravity of the interests at stake, and the bitterness of party-feeling, from the following words, written a few days before the commencement of the struggle by the most able and the most respected of the Prussian Conservatives, Herr von Gerlach : "If the government throws itself into this conflict with courageous spirit and vigorous arm,—and its strength is very great if rightly used,—the provisional condition will not last long. We are once more in November 1848. Then as now the King was threatened by the people, for so the Democrats were already called. But the victory at that time was much more hard. There was real danger. Insurrection broke out in several places. But in a few days, after the first acts of spirit on the part of the crown, it was proved that the people loved and stood by their king, and not by the Democrats. . . . The breach with the House of Deputies is a misfortune ; but not to break with a house in which the majority seeks to subject to itself the army and the King, that would be a far greater evil."

Belgium. The treaty of commerce between England and Belgium has brought the internal condition of that country into relation with our interests. And it is impossible to understand



the causes which impeded the measure, and awakened so much national ill-will, without studying the character of the two great parties into which the country is divided. That character is in many ways peculiar. In no other land is religion so exclusively the watchword of one party, or liberalism so exclusively the monopoly of the other. The consequence is, that while the debates of the Belgian Parliament are full of singular instruction, because they turn, more frequently than those of older states, on the elementary doctrines of government, the divorce between religious and liberal professions has driven both sides to deplorable extremes of hostility.

The Catholic party of Belgium was in office from the Revolution of 1830 to the year 1841, and on some subsequent occasions. Catholics drew up the Constitution, elected the Protestant King Leopold, and carried all the chief fundamental laws. Many of them are of great political capacity. They are led in the lower house by the Count de Theux, in the Senate by Baron d'Anethon and M. Jules Malou. Their most important men are MM. Dechamps, Alphonse Nothomb, Vilain XIV., Barthélemy du Mortier, Kervyn de Lettenhove, Mercier, and Coomans. They profess a boundless devotion to the interests of the Church. In their party we find two shades, the "old" and the "young." The young Catholics wish politics to be distinct from religion; they have few exclusively religious articles or announcements in their journals; and they never speak about the Church unnecessarily. Their first experiment was a failure. M. de Decker's ministry, by trying to shelve the inevitable questions, displeased the old Catholics, and his organ, the *Universel*, was forced to be as theological as the *Journal de Bruxelles*. The division between these two schools is very narrow, and unknown outside the Chambers. The Catholic party is made up not only of the religious part of society, but of all Conservatives. It holds to the letter and spirit of the Constitution of 1830. It is the constant defender of the liberty of the press, the liberty of association, the liberty of worship, and the liberty of teaching.

The Liberal party is made up of the descendants of the old functionaries or partisans of the Austrian Government; of Vonkists (the French section of the partisans of the Brabant revolution against Austria in 1789); of partisans of the first French Revolution; of Bonapartist functionaries; of Orangemen (partisans of the Dutch Government of 1815-30); and (chiefly) of the holders of the national or church property sold by the French revolutionary Government. Although its title was recognised by the Concordat of 1801, this property has never been favourably regarded. Though the clergy have advised the most respectable families to buy portions of it, few have followed their advice. Some of the descendants of the original purchasers have wished to restore it to the Church; and it is often difficult to convince them that they are not bound in conscience to do so. To this list we must add many officials who owe their places to the Liberal government, and, in general, the men of movement. The spirit of this party is that of the masonic lodges, whose leaders, the "Knights Kadosch" and the "Knights of Asia," respectively swear

to labour to destroy all positive religions and all monarchies. The Liberal party also includes republicans, democrats, and socialists, though the great body of the party disowns them. There are many more who aim at destroying the liberty of the Church, under pretext of liberty of conscience. Yet the Liberal electors are generally as good Catholics as the rest of the Belgians; even among the prominent men there are some really religious persons, such as M. Eudore Pirmez, the best lawyer in the Chamber; another member, who, when the recognition of the kingdom of Italy was discussed in the Chambers, was absent through illness, wrote to the president, that though he was a devoted child of the Church, he should nevertheless have voted for the ministry. In more than one debate the Liberals have professed themselves to be as good Catholics as the Catholic party. There are persons among them who go to Mass daily; very few among them die without sending for a priest; but the spirit of the party, as a party, is incontestably hostile to the Church.

As this party was built up out of the fragments of so many old parties, it required a programme. This was furnished by Teste, a French refugee under the Restoration, who practised law at Liège. He taught the young Belgians "the doctrine," that is, the theory, of the French *doctrinaires*: it is a compound of liberty and servitude, exalting public liberty at the expense of private liberty; theoretically lodging power in the people, in order to transfer it to the ministry in practice; teaching the majority to crush the minority; entrusting the government with all great national and private interests; and centralising the whole administration of the country. As William I. would have nothing to do with a system which permits the king to reign, but not to govern, Teste's disciples were first neglected, and then as badly treated by the government as the Catholics. This common grievance of Catholics and Liberals led to a temporary union; the two parties voted indifferently for each other at the elections; they petitioned in common; they made the revolution together; and in the congress which drew up the Constitution, where the Catholics had an immense majority, the agreement appeared to be perfect. Thus matters remained till 1839, when M. Devaux, the cleverest of the *doctrinaire* Liberals, seeing that Belgium was established as a nation, thought that the national motto, *L'union fait la force*, was no longer applicable; but that, if its institutions were to be worked, the country must be divided into two parties. He published a series of articles to this effect in the *Revue Nationale*, in which he put forward the unhappy idea of founding the two parties on moral and religious distinctions. Up to that time, the ministries used to contain men of all kinds; ever since, they have been exclusively Catholic or exclusively Liberal. The country has been divided into two opposing sections, and the parliament has been occupied with purposeless debates. The Catholics in vain opposed this policy. The Liberals set up their electoral associations, and managed to gain a majority in the lower house by persuading the peasants that the clerical party intended to reimpose the tithe.

Hereupon a Liberal congress was held in the Hôtel de Ville of



Brussels, more or less in opposition to the Congress of 1830, where certain articles were adopted to be the guide of the party. After getting the power into their hands, the first thing they did was to fortify themselves by the American practice, new to Belgium, of giving all the patronage of the government to their supporters exclusively. In 1848, both parties united to stem the torrent of revolution; and the Catholics joined in passing all the laws which the most advanced democrats could desire. After the storm was over, a Conservative majority was returned; the King formed a Catholic cabinet under M. de Decker. In the first years of this government, the country was profoundly calm. But the ministry had a question to solve. The preceding government had, on its own authority, set aside certain wills, and assigned to the *bureaux de bienfaisance* the legacies therein left to churches, or to private charities. The unpopularity of these acts had been one reason of their fall. M. de Decker's ministry proposed a law to permit the founding of private charities, under the administration of official persons (military, civil, or ecclesiastical), to be named in the act of donation, or the will, and approved by the government. To preserve the substance of liberty, a great many of its forms were sacrificed. The Superior-General of the Christian Brothers was terrified at the idea of his establishments being subjected to such a *régime*. Among the Bishops, one was considered favourable to the project, and the rest indifferent, except one who strongly opposed the notion of giving the administrators of charities an official character, and making them dependent on the government. But the measure was opposed by the Liberals, as far too favourable to convents; all history was searched for abuses; and a cry against mortmain was raised; but as the country did not stir, a riot was organised at Brussels; and people began to believe that there was something serious in the riots of May 1857. Other towns followed the example of Brussels. The Catholic party once more lost the confidence of the country, as was shown in the communal elections of October; and the De Decker ministry, deserted by the King, tendered its resignation, in spite of the large majority which it still had in the Chamber. The King formed a Liberal cabinet; the Chambers were dissolved; and the new elections gave the Liberals a crushing majority, which was so much diminished in the next election, that in the last session the cabinet could barely subsist from day to day, and dreaded a defeat on any question that might arise. This weakness had already disorganised the cabinet. Last year, M. Frère, the minister of finance, had tendered his resignation because he had been obliged to admit the currency of French, Swiss, and Italian gold in Belgium; as the Liberal party has no other financier, the office remained vacant for several months. Towards the end of 1861, M. de Vrière, the Foreign Minister, took the same step, because he refused to follow his colleagues in recognising the kingdom of Italy. M. Rogier, Minister of the Interior, had lost the respect of the Chambers and of his party, and displayed all the peevishness of an irritable old man whenever he had to give explanations to the Chamber. M. Tesch,

Minister of Justice, had lost caste : a trial at Ostend had covered him with ridicule; his connection with the Great Luxemburg Railway had involved him in its unpopularity; and an order of the Liberal Ministry in 1848, placing him under surveillance as a member of a French revolutionary conspiracy, was from time to time raked up against him. M. Vanderstichelen, Minister of Public Works, was the object of similar attacks. The Minister of War had to bear all the unpopularity of the fortification of Antwerp, and of certain arbitrary proceedings against a Colonel Hayez. But this had nothing to do with the cabinet; for the King has always wisely kept military affairs independent of the movement of parties, and the Minister of War was not even a member of the Chambers. The ministry, however, appeared to be on the point of expiring, and M. de Brouckère, the leader of the centre, and the natural head of all transitional cabinets, was getting ready to carry on the government, when M. Frère was persuaded to return to the finance department. M. Rogier was transferred to the insignificant post of Foreign Affairs, and M. V. de Peereboom, the youngest of the old Liberals, or the oldest of the young ones, was made Minister of the Interior; the rest remained as they were. The only man of any weight in this re-constructed cabinet was M. Frère. Of obscure family, his talents and laboriousness have gained him the esteem and respect of the country. Despotic in character, he persuades or compels his party to do almost every thing he wishes. He exerts the same authority in the offices of the Treasury : all that depends on him must go on with military precision. Though, as he once told the Chamber, he had not the advantage of being nursed on the lap of a duchess, no one, in Chamber or Senate, has more aristocratic manners; but he reminds one more of the Russian than the French gentleman. When he is in opposition, he likes to play the tribune, and even to make a slight discovery of the cloven foot of revolution. But when he is in power, he is often more conservative than the Catholics, and no one makes so small account of the desires and will of the people. "It is for us," he says, "to enlighten the masses, but not to follow their aspirations." His party says of him that he has not the "instinct of taxation." It is possible that he may have made mistakes in this line; but, taking him all in all, it is incontestable that he is a finance minister of the first rank, and that the country owes him much. He, with M. Eudore Pirmez in the Chamber, and M. Forgeur in the Senate, are the only considerable men that the Liberal party possesses in Parliament. Its old leaders have broken down with age, and its new members are either insignificant or commonplace. They cannot even find a respectable President of the Chamber. The whole party are so notoriously inferior, that last winter they were all put into a farce, which was played for two months in Brussels, and in every town of Belgium where there is a theatre to play it, and even in the streets during the Carnival; and every body was ready to die with laughing at the ridiculous figures which the Liberal playwright had made his friends cut. One of the causes of this weakness is the old division of the



Liberals into the "old and young;" the young Liberals are generally the pupils of the Free University of Brussels (which is infidel in its philosophical classes), and push democracy to the very extreme of Radicalism and what they call progress. The ministry, when it first came into power, had made these men great promises, but had performed very little; hence there were continual skirmishes between the two sections of the party, and only a truce when they united against the clericals. And in these united attacks the ministry expended more powder than shot. Hence the continual reproaches of the young Liberals. M. Frère, therefore, when he reentered the cabinet, gave a more aggressive character to the ministerial policy. The recognition of the kingdom of Italy, and a quantity of measures hostile to the Church, were announced in the King's speech. All these measures had one single object,—to deprive the Church of her external means of influence, and to reduce Belgium to a people guided by principles quite independent of any reference to the clergy. On this point the whole debate between the two parties turns. The *politiques* or *doctrinaires* do not wish to make any sudden transition, but to proceed step by step. The young Liberals wish to go faster. A great progress has been made in the present year. By means of ministerial circulars, and new interpretations, M. Van de Peereboom has introduced important modifications into the law of primary instruction. Although the letter of the constitution secures common rights for all, an edict has pronounced a special punishment for priests who, for instance, preach against the law of divorce, or any other which expressly permits acts forbidden by the divine or ecclesiastical law. In the new penal enactments the liberty of the press is also restrained; the Catholics, against whom this measure was directed, voted against it, while the Liberals, who had nothing to fear from it, supported it. Another attack on the Church has been made on the question of cemeteries: in Belgium, these were restored to the churches by the Emperor Napoleon I. In conformity with canon law, and the regulations of Joseph II. and Napoleon, there is, in every Catholic cemetery, a portion left unconsecrated, for the burial of unbaptised children, and all who are not in condition to receive ecclesiastical sepulture. When a man who has lived like an infidel dies without the sacraments, the difficulties of the family are often great. People do not like to see their relations buried in profane ground. Now the Code-Napoleon gives the burgomaster the regulation of the cemeteries. Up to a recent period, the law has always been so interpreted as to oblige him to act in each case according to the rules of the religious body to which the cemetery belongs; he could not order a grave to be dug in a Jewish cemetery in a place where a corpse had been interred before; nor could he cause a man to whom the Church refused ecclesiastical sepulture to be buried in the consecrated part of a Catholic cemetery. This rule had been generally observed, and though the few infractions that had occurred had led to some disturbances, they had never been brought before the tribunals. But in July last an event occurred at the cemetery of Uccle, near Brussels, which

was not so lightly passed over. An officer was visited by several priests during his last illness, to induce him to receive the sacraments. They were courteously received, but informed that he intended to die, as he had lived, without making any religious profession, and that his will was, that he should be buried outside the consecrated ground. The burgomaster directed his grave to be dug accordingly. But his family appealed, and the burgomaster gave contrary orders. The curé protested; and the churchwardens petitioned both the Chamber and the Senate. A debate, which extended to the whole question of religious liberty, ensued, and lasted eight days. In the Chamber, M. A. Nothomb made the greatest sensation, and the Minister of the Interior asked as a personal favour that the debate might cease, and accepted the motion of the Catholics, which was, that the petition should be referred to him for explanations. M. Frère, in the Senate, tried to retrieve this defeat; he spoke with extraordinary boldness and defiance. Thus, in the course of this last session, all the great questions of freedom have been discussed; and the debates have been more remarkable than in any year since 1830.

The budget has also been curiously scanned; not for the purpose of altering the expenditure, but to improve its administration. In all the debates on this subject, the members of the Catholic party took a considerable share. For the Catholic part of Belgium has its own economical position. Companies which have Catholic names among their directors (for the spirit of party division introduced by M. Devaux unhappily extends even to commerce) are most trusted in the country, and are thought more solid and safe, but less bold and enterprising, than the Liberal speculations. The Catholics are generally supposed to be adverse to those rapid means of growing rich which not only make men worshipers of material greatness, but also lead them to a love of speculation, which often ends in ruin. Among the financial laws of this year, the most remarkable is that of M. Frère, by which 14,010,000 fr. were assigned to public works, out of the surplus of different budgets. This is an idea which he has been realising since 1859. Belgium, like her more fortunate sister Holland, usually has a surplus; and M. Frère's doctrine is, that extraordinary works must only be undertaken when there is a surplus in the ordinary receipts. Belgium has no treasury bonds in circulation; the interest of debt and pensions amount to 40,533,113 fr., of which 17,370,265 fr. are covered by the profits of the government railways; the profit of canals and other public property reduces the interest payable out of the taxation to 15,000,000 fr. There is, then, plenty of margin for increasing the debt; but M. Frère opposes every proposal of the kind. The railways constructed by government paid, in 1861, 7.312 per cent. This is an excellent profit on money borrowed at 4 or  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. But M. Frère will not hear of reducing the taxation by such means; he only promises to convert the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  into 4 per cent stock; for the rest, he insists upon administering the state revenues exactly as a gentleman administers his estates; he will only employ the surplus of his rents in improving his property, especially in such critical times as the present.



But with this alone, between 1859 and 1865, Belgium will have expended more than 80,000,000fr. on extraordinary public works, and there will still remain something over.

The ordinary expenditure of the country amounts to 144,500,000fr. The receipts amount to about 155,500,000 fr., leaving an ordinary surplus of about 11,000,000fr. It is undeniable that this excellent position depends on the administration, which is generally independent of the professional party quarrels in Parliament. Both Liberal and Catholic finance ministers go on the same system; and the Count de Meens and MM. Mercier and Malou are praised by the Liberals as much as M. Frère by the Catholics. The *employés* are excellent; the Belgian treasury is a school to which the Northern governments send their best civil officers to learn finance. But the system is very simple. The method of keeping the accounts is of French origin, and has been little changed. The *cour des comptes* is the guardian of the finances. The budget is not voted by chapters, or by portfolios, but by articles, some of which may only be for a few francs. There is no transfer, or any thing of the kind. The different ministers must shape themselves to their respective budgets as to a bed of Procrustes. The *cour des comptes* is independent of the cabinet, and has to see that nothing out of order takes place. The treasury cannot issue a centime before the *cour des comptes* has countersigned the check, and has seen the article of the budget by virtue of which the expense has been incurred. In case of irregularities or doubts, a correspondence ensues between the minister and the court; and if they cannot agree, the affair is referred to the Chamber. The court publishes its report annually, and makes its observations upon the financial situation of the country; it is extremely gentle and equitable in its proceedings, but still it is the bugbear of each minister. As guardian of the public purse, it is gradually extending the range of its surveillance. It now regulates postage-stamps, railway-tickets, the furnishing of all official residences, and of national establishments. The Minister of Finance is its first victim; the rest will be swallowed by degrees. There is no private fortune so well managed as it manages the income of Belgium; and it has introduced such a principle of honour among the officials, that any one of them who is suspected of fraud generally makes away with himself in prison.

Taxation in Belgium is very moderate. Although the abolition of the octroi and all local rates has added more than 15,000,000fr. to the budget of the State (for the compensation of the communes), the taxes only amount to about 25fr. a head. Reduced to the standard of the value of wheat, this was precisely the amount or Belgian taxation under the Austrians and under the Consulate; but under the Austrian *régime* they had to pay, over and above the taxes, the feudal dues and tithes; and a great part of the land was in the hands of the clergy, who are now paid out of the taxes. M. Devaux maintains that the value of property in Belgium has quadrupled since 1830. This can only be true of personalty and manufacturing property. In Ghent the number of factories has doubled since the

time of William I., and each factory has from two to four times more producing power than it had thirty years ago. The iron-works have quadrupled in value since an economical process was discovered for separating the sulphur; and the coal-mines have constantly progressed, till the last mild winter and the dearth of cotton reduced the demand.

Free trade in Belgium is not a question on which the two parties, Liberal and Catholic, are divided. Since M. Charles de Brouckère and M. Arrivabene set up the first free-trade association, the Catholics and the Liberals split themselves up into different groups upon the question, which has never for a moment formed a ground of division between the two parties. M. Coomans, the editor of the *Emancipation*, one of the chief Catholic papers, has always demanded a complete emancipation of commerce, an equal freedom of trade for agriculturists and manufacturers, to be at once conceded. The *Journal de Bruxelles*, a still more important organ, has always supported a gradual introduction of free trade by the progressive diminution of the tariff. It was a Conservative and a Catholic, M. Dechamps, who, like Sir Robert Peel, gave the first blow to protection, by opening the ports to grain, on occasion of a bad harvest. The loudest cries against the commercial treaty with England have come from the Liberal clubs of Ghent; and they would never have elected the Minister of Public Works if they had not been assured that there was no such treaty being negotiated. So far from the present distress in Belgium being attributed to protection, the distress has been the chief ground relied on by the advocates of protection. M. Rogier has maintained, all through the debate, that it had nothing to do either with free trade or protection, but simply with the decreased demand for coal and the short supply of cotton. Since the Italian war also, a timidity has come over men's minds, which has had an unfavourable influence on Belgian commerce, and made it exceedingly cautious. Every possible risk is anxiously avoided. Ocean trade yields to coasting trade. Assurance companies send all heavy policies abroad. Merchants make endless inquiries into the solvency of purchasers, and so on. It is in consequence of this spirit, that Belgium has not suffered in the great commercial crises of England and America during the last twenty years. It is through this that the Dutch insurance companies have suffered nearly the whole loss of the great fire of Antwerp. The National Bank, which has been fourteen years in existence, and which does business to the amount of 1,000,000,000fr. or 40,000,000*l.* per annum, never made a bad debt till last year, and its loss (16,000fr.) has already been partly refunded and partly secured. The reason is, that it never negotiates doubtful paper. While the Belgian merchant has this fear of risk before his eyes, it is impossible that the political uneasiness of Europe should not react on Belgian commerce. But the reaction cannot be very great, since the produce of the indirect taxes tends rather to increase than to diminish. There are, however, three trades that are suffering—lace, cotton, and coal. Some months ago, the commercial association had eight-millions-worth of coal on its hands which it



could not dispose of. All the pits are in the same case. The miners have only three days' work a week, and they are paid 2fr. a day instead of 3fr. 50c.; and this they have rather as alms than as pay. It would be to the interest of the masters to shut up the pits. Hence there is great distress among the colliers, especially in the neighbourhood of Mons, where the strike and the riots of Borinage in July only aggravated the evil; and the cabinet is pressing on the demolition of the fortifications of Mons to find work for them.

All the cotton manufacturers have been obliged, like those of England, to slacken work for want of raw material. But the distress has been prevented by the employment of the workmen on the fortifications at Antwerp, and similar public works. It is moreover rare in Belgium that all the members of one family should follow the same craft; hence they are rarely all out of work at once. The labouring population is much more distressed by the collapse of the lace-trade than by the want of cotton. When the manufacture of hand-woven cloth failed in Flanders, a period of distress ensued, which was terribly aggravated by the bad harvests of 1845 and 1846; as a last resource, the curés introduced nuns into a great number of the villages to teach various small trades to the peasant children. Among these, lace-making made a marvellous progress, and soon became so profitable that the children supported their parents. The father of the largest family was the luckiest man; even the boys learned the trade. The societies of St. Vincent of Paul encouraged the employment, and within a few years Flanders was comparatively prosperous, and mendicity had disappeared. This favourable situation is not altogether destroyed, though for the moment there is much distress. There has been great exaggeration in the reports; the stories of starving families dying under hedges are quite mythical.

There is no extraordinary distress, only a kind of tightness, in Flanders, South Brabant, and Hainaut. The papers no longer speak of it. Queen Victoria gave 2000*l.* for the Belgian poor, not because their sufferings were so much greater than usual, but partly to make the commercial treaty popular, and partly to allay the irritation which many Belgians feel against every thing English, because of the fortifications of Antwerp. People have been made to believe that this is an English plot to destroy the commercial elasticity of the port, which, they were told, threatened soon to rival London in importance.

The treaty with England has put its seal upon the commercial policy of the country. The government, as in France, were in advance of popular opinion, but free trade would have been a necessity in a very few years. It was not opposed *ex professo* by the opposition; but by some perhaps out of the conviction that, like all measures which aim at material wealth, it is contrary to spiritual religion, and certainly by others out of the conviction that its tendency will be to destroy the "little industries,"—the family looms and the like, requiring scarcely any capital,—which maintain a class between the poorer burgesses and the day-labourers, the representatives of the old trades of Flanders, and the most honest and respectable class in

the country. These small trades, it is said, must be ruined by factories, machinery, and capital; and the class will sink into that of day-labourers, and tend to feed the proletariat and the paupers, already much too numerous. Free trade, though it has not caused, will hasten this change. The treaty was also opposed by the various sections of manufacturers, who considered that they might lose by free trade—the clothiers of Verviers, the Liberal iron-masters of Liège, the coal-owners of Hainaut, and the manufacturers of Brussels and Ghent. The treaty, with two supplementary protocols containing modifications which the ministry were obliged to promise to the Chambers, was published in the *Gazette* of September 2. It is destructive of hindrances to commerce, not constructive of any special system. It withdraws commerce from the control of municipal law, assimilates to some extent the commercial code of the two nations, and gives to the foreigner absolutely the same rights as the native enjoys. It applies the criterion of Belgian law to determine what is a Belgian ship, and the British criterion to determine what is British. No privileges can be granted to subjects of one power without their being *ipso facto* granted to those of the other; and no discriminating dues are to be levied. Each country admits the vessels of the other to its coasting trade; property in trade-marks and the like is the same for both countries; and provisions are made for property saved from wrecks being delivered to the owners, with only the salvage deducted. The treaty was signed in London on the 3d of July, and the bill was carried in the Belgian Chamber on the 13th of August by 76 against 19 votes, after a debate in which M. Mortier was the chief opponent of the measure; in the Senate it was carried on the 21st of August by 26 against 6 votes. These numbers show that there was no party division. The ratifications were exchanged on the 30th of August.

During the first period of the Rattazzi administration, it was doubtful whether the impulsive force of the Italian revolution would serve the monarchy or the republic. Mazzini and the King contended for the possession of Garibaldi. The coolness of the politic, but unpopular, minister severely tried the patience of the party of action, and in the first movement of the most ardent revolutionists the victory remained with the government. It was ever the policy of Mazzini to speculate on the insecurity of powers he had no present hope of being able to overthrow. The certainty of defeat and failure was a part of his calculation, and the constant disturbance and alarm of governments served to prepare opportunities, if not triumphs, for his party. The desperate and prodigal course which succeeded at last in shattering established thrones promised still greater results against a situation which is provisional, unnatural, and unsettled. When, therefore, the ministry succeeded in dividing the revolutionary party, Garibaldi remained in the hands of the republicans; and they determined to strike a blow which might destroy the temporising ministry, and which might exhibit in so



formidable a light the energy of the national hopes as to join the safety of the monarchy and the peace of Europe to the other arguments against the occupation of Rome.

Whilst this design was being matured, the minister, true to his character, continued to temporise. He was willing that the party of action should exhaust itself in a great demonstration, and ruin itself by a portentous failure. Garibaldi, when he could no longer serve the government, was a great inconvenience. It was determined to give him time to accomplish his own destruction. But although it was necessary that the fruit should be perfectly ripe and the danger imminent, it was necessary too that the measures by which it was encountered should be swift, complete, and sure. The policy of the government, therefore, was forbearance pushed to the very verge of a perfidious complicity, and then rapid and decisive action, whose fruits would more than compensate for the appearance of a shameful plot. The opposite characters of the men whom he employed enabled the minister to carry out his design. At first the friends of Garibaldi were in the ascendant, and he relied on his partisans in the government. Then came the turn of the uncompromising servants of the State, of Cialdini, Persano, La Marmora.

Early in July Garibaldi appeared in Sicily, with the recognised mission of organising the rifle associations. In the scene of his greatest achievements he was surrounded by memories of the most splendid portion of his military career, when the display of his political incompetency had not yet supplied the measure of his powers. In no part of the monarchy had the revolution been inspired by so definite a sense of wrong, or so sincere a hatred of arbitrary rule. Nowhere had the revolutionary movement been more perfectly organised, or had retained more of its original spirit, than in the stronghold from which Garibaldi went forth in 1860 to the conquest of Italy. He at once found himself in the midst of ardent admirers, of men eager for Italian unity, and not enthusiastic for the House of Savoy. At great meetings he spoke of the necessity of action, of the evils of repose, of the perfidy of Napoleon. "I am sick," he said in one place, "of this state of inaction in which we are left, this inert life, devoid of glory, and I can bear it no longer." On his arrival at Palermo, he said, in presence of the prefect of the city, "The autocrat of France can never be our friend. Every Italian who has been so far misled as to believe in his friendship must abandon the delusion. The French people are trodden down by despotism. Like ourselves, they stand in need of deliverance. Do not confound the nation with its tyrant. All nations are our brethren." In order to effect a diversion in support of the attack he was preparing, Garibaldi sent forth a proclamation to the Hungarians calling on them to rise against Austria. Volunteers began to arrive in great numbers. Money was supplied from England. At Marsala, in the midst of a tumultuous enthusiasm, he announced that he would drive the stranger from the Italian soil, and that he would give Italy her capital. And the people repeated after him, again and again, the cry of "Rome or Death!" The soldier who had achieved the

unity of Italy was determined either to expel the Pope from Rome, or to shatter the monarchy which he himself had made.

Fortune abandons her favourites when they presume too much, and the sword which struck terror into friend and foe, and had long been deemed invincible, broke against the triple crown. The King issued a proclamation against Garibaldi. The Prefect of Palermo was dismissed. The Syndic of Marsala was dismissed. General Cialdini was made dictator in Sicily. Martial law was proclaimed there, and afterwards in Naples. General Klapka rejected the appeal to the Hungarians. An army of twenty-five thousand men closed on the little force of Garibaldi. With a few thousand adventurers he evaded the royal troops, and entered Catania on the 19th of August, whilst many of the King's officers threw up their commissions. On the 25th, he landed at Melito on the Calabrian coast. On the 28th, he marched on Reggio. But the town was occupied by the royal troops. Garibaldi feared an encounter, and led his force into the mountains. On the following day, he was surrounded at Aspromonte; and after an action of a few minutes, he was wounded and taken captive with all his band.

The Italian government, by this important victory, has proved its capacity to repress the revolution without the aid of France, and has been obliged to shed blood for the maintenance of the temporal power. The occupation of Rome has thus become more difficult to defend; and the Emperor Napoleon has been compelled to advance a step towards the solution of the Roman question. He has done the least he could possibly do. He has not issued a new manifesto, but has published a letter to M. Thouvenel, written on the 20th of May, which is far indeed from being a concession to the violent party, and must be regarded as one of the wisest statements he has ever given to the world. It amounts to a proposal to exchange the occupation of Rome for a guarantee and moral protectorate of the independence of the temporal sovereignty over the patrimony of St. Peter, which is to be secured at home by measures such as Ultramontane writers have been the most earnest to recommend. The distinct repudiation of the idea that Rome can ever be the capital of Italy will not be unfavourably received by the moderate adherents of the Italian kingdom; but it is obvious that the guarantee of France is no permanent security, and that the Emperor practically offers the Pope nothing but his advice. The following are the most important passages of this remarkable State-paper:

"The religious question adds considerably to the gravity of the situation, and multiplies the adversaries of the new order of things established beyond the Alps. Not long ago the Absolutist party was the only one opposed to it. Now the majority of the Catholic populations in Europe are hostile to it; and that hostility not only thwarts the benevolent intentions of the governments attached by their faith to the Holy See, but stops the favourable intentions of the Protestant or schismatic governments who have to deal with a considerable fraction of their subjects. Thus, every where it is the religious idea which cools the public feeling for Italy. Her recon-



ciliation with the Pope would obviate many difficulties, and rally round her millions of adversaries.

“ On the other hand, the Holy See has an equal interest, if not a stronger one, in this reconciliation; for, if the Holy See has zealous supporters among all fervent Catholics, it has against itself all the Liberals of Europe. In politics it is looked upon as the representative of the prejudices of the *ancien régime*, and in the eyes of Italy as the enemy of her independence, the most devoted partisan of reaction. This is why the Pope is surrounded by the most violent adherents of fallen dynasties, and this company is not of a nature to procure for him the sympathy of the people who upset those dynasties. Nevertheless this state of things does less harm to the Sovereign than it does to the Head of Religion. In Catholic countries, where new ideas have a great hold, men who are most sincerely attached to their faith feel troubled in their conscience and doubts enter their minds, not knowing how to reconcile their political convictions with religious principles which seem to condemn modern civilisation. If this state of things, so pregnant with danger, should be prolonged, there would be a risk of political dissensions leading to lamentable dissensions in faith itself. . . . .

“ To be master in his own domain, independence must be insured to him, and his rule freely accepted by his subjects. It must be hoped that it would be so—on the one hand, when the Italian government would take the engagement towards France to recognise the States of the Church and the limitation line agreed upon; on the other hand, when the government of the Holy See, returning to ancient traditions, would sanction the privileges of the municipalities and of the provinces in such guise that they would, so to say, govern themselves; for then the power of the Pope, soaring in a sphere elevated above the secondary interests of society, would be free from that responsibility which is always heavy, and which only a strong government can stand.”

By the treaty of Ackermann, 6th October 1826, it was settled that no Mahometans should be suffered to remain in Servia, except within the fortress-towns which were occupied by the Turks. Attached to one of these, Belgrade, is a suburb, in which Turks continued to reside; and the question arose whether this was within or without the fortress. It was referred to Russia, and was decided in 1833 in favour of the Turks. This decision was respected till the question was reopened this year by the forcible eviction of the Turks from the suburb, and the pillage of their property. The Turkish governor of the fortress replied by bombarding the town. The Servians seemed on the point of rising, to make common cause with the Slaves of the Herzegovina and Montenegro, Bosnia, and Bulgaria, and, with the assistance of the Greeks, to destroy the Turkish empire. It was no secret that France and Russia favoured this policy, which was opposed by Austria and England.

The Russian interests in the matter are simple. Russia wishes

to destroy the obstacle to its power in the Black Sea; to seize Constantinople, or, if that is not permitted, to allow Greece, under its protectorate, to extend to the Balkan, and to establish a confederation of the Slave provinces of the Danube; both States being in alliance with itself,—the Greeks through community of religion, the Slaves through community of race.

The English policy is equally simple: to maintain Turkey, as a check upon Russia in the East; to maintain Austria, as a power to intervene between Russia and Turkey on the Danube; and to check the growth of Greece, by keeping the Ionian Islands divided from it.

The Austrian interests are more complicated. They are partly material, partly moral. Opposition to Russian aggrandisement on the Black Sea and Danube; the freedom of the navigation of the Danube; the maintenance of commercial monopolies with respect to the Slave States bordering the Danube and the Adriatic, by which Austria aggrandises itself at the expense of Turkey; the danger of becoming a Slave instead of a German power, if it should extend its own dominions over those provinces, and admit their inhabitants to its parliament (a course to which its own interests incline Prussia to force Austria); and the tendency of the Italian revolution to make the Turkish provinces a step to its entrance into Hungary and the Slave States of the Austrian Empire;—all require it to keep the Turkish empire in its present state. While the natural sympathy of Christians with Christians under a barbarous yoke of continual misgovernment and frequent oppression, the fellow-feeling of Austrian Slaves for those of the same race in the Turkish empire, the wish of the Hungarians to regain the old provinces of the kingdom that were taken from it by the Turks, the gratitude of the Austrians to the Slaves of the Turkish provinces for the assistance they rendered during the agony of the empire in 1849, and their resentment against the Mussulmans for the part played by them at the same crisis,—are all elements that make it difficult for Austria to take a positive and active share in maintaining a state of things so disagreeable to the Christian populations as the present.

The French interests are partly derived from France being the champion of ideas. The protector of Christianity in the East, the power that fought in the Crimea as much for the liberty of the Christians of Turkey as for the maintenance of the Turkish empire, the great revolutionary centre of Europe, cannot be indifferent to a revolution of Christians against their Turkish masters. The old alliance between France and Turkey came to a head in the Crimean war, and burst. Napoleon III. entered into that war not, as M. Laguerronnière says, to preserve Turkey, but to conquer the Russian alliance. The Italian war against Austria, which arose out of the Austrian opposition to the substitution of the Russian partisan Constantine Obrenowich for Kara Georgewich on the Servian throne (December 23, 1858), was not intended to destroy Austria, but to conquer the Austrian alliance,—an alliance which clearly entered into the Franco-Russian plans, but which demanded three conditions hard for Austria to consent to:—the elimination of the Turks from Europe;



the union of the Greek race in a kingdom extending to the Balkans; and a Slave confederation between the Danube and the Balkans.

From these indications we may understand why Russia and France wish the Turks to evacuate Servia; why England and Austria oppose; and how it is that the Turks cannot do so without raising a Slave insurrection, encouraging the hopes of Greece, and preparing for their own expulsion from Constantinople.

Of the population of Turkey in Europe (16,085,000), the Slaves are nearly half (45·89 per cent); Wallachs, 26·74 per cent; Albanians, 9·94; Greeks, 6·55, and the Turks also 6·55, or one Turk for every 16 inhabitants. How these various races, in spite of profound religious divisions, and in spite of a common subjection to the Turkish empire, have still preserved their national characteristics, a national sentiment, and a national aspiration, is one of the most curious theorems of ethnology. Yet the case is so. The following sketch will give some idea of the religious divisions:

In 1844, Servia, Wallachia, and Moldavia, the recognised Danubian provinces, contained respectively 1,000,000, 2,600,000, and 1,400,000,—in all, 5,000,000 inhabitants. Of these only 30,000 were Mahometans; the rest belonged to the Orthodox Church, except 45,000 Catholics in Moldavia, 35,000 in Wallachia, and 1300 in Servia. Montenegro, the independence of which was sometimes acknowledged and sometimes denied by the Porte, contains only 120,000 inhabitants, all of the Orthodox communion. In Bosnia there are 350,000 Mahometans, 450,000 Orthodox, and 100,000 Catholics; in the Herzegovina, 60,000 Mahometans, 75,000 Orthodox, and 50,000 Catholics. The Mahometans are mainly descendants of the Bosnian nobles who apostatised at the time of the Turkish conquest in the sixteenth century, in order to keep their estates and their feudal privileges. By this and subsequent changes the Catholics lost more than the Greeks. The Mahometan converts, though fanatics in religion, never entirely forgot their race, their ancestors, and certain fragments of Christian civilisation. Hence they can at times unite rather with their Christian countrymen than with their Turkish co-religionists. In Western Bulgaria there are about 500,000 Mahometans to 600,000 Christians; in Eastern Bulgaria, 1,000,000 of the former to 180,000 of the latter. In the more central pashaliks the proportion of Mahometans to Christians is as follows: Adrianople, 450,000 to 900,000; Nisch, 470,000 to 680,000; Roumelia, 640,000 to 760,000; Uskub, 350,000 to 350,000; Janina, 250,000 to 675,000; Salonica, 475,000 to about 476,000; Constantinople, 630,000 to 315,000. In all these pashaliks, and especially in Albania and to the east of Montenegro, there are Catholic villages and communities, amounting perhaps in the whole to 100,000.

We see, then, that except in the Danubian provinces the numerical preponderance of Christians over Mahometans is not so great as is usually supposed. The Christians moreover have little cohesion among themselves. The common calamity which has failed to unite them, has only embittered their mutual jealousy. The Catholics dread the Orthodox Christians more than they fear the Turks.

Hence they support the Turks against the Orthodox. Albanian Catholics served in the Turkish army that invaded Montenegro. These quarrels do not merely divide the Christians of the two rites ; but each Christian village, almost each family, has its feuds, which are hereditary. Again, the Slaves, as a race, have little notion of state, country, or nation ; they have no political ideas, no patriotism. Their highest combinations are families and villages. Hence a general movement is impossible amongst them. Again, except in the principalities, the Mahometans form the immense majority of the populations of towns and cities. They possess the fortresses and all the centres ; hence they are concentrated, while the Christians are dispersed in village groups, some Orthodox, some Catholic, with perhaps a Mahometan village between them. A group of villages of the same religion is seldom found together. Hence a village has seldom any relations with those outside its own boundaries, and the rural population lives in the greatest isolation. The chief feeling of these villages is terror of the Turks, produced by a long tradition of their brutalities. This fear is now a great source of strength to the Ottoman empire. Again, what little military science and combination is to be found in Turkey is in the Turkish armies, as instructed by European officers like Omer Pasha. The tactics of the late invasion of Montenegro showed no genius on the part of the Turks, and simple ignorance on the part of the Montenegrins. Like barbarian boxers, they guarded the place where a blow had been struck, but could never foresee where the next was to be expected, or take precautions against it. When the Turks lately penetrated with two armies into Montenegro from Niksiçi on the north, and Scutari on the south, to form a junction in the heart of the country, the Montenegrins, instead of concentrating their forces, and crushing first one and then the other army, divided them, to oppose the progress of both at once. Then, when the united army was cut off by passes from its supplies at Scutari, the Montenegrins never attempted to cut off their communications ; but always, with the greatest personal bravery, withstood the movements of the main army, till, on the 27th of August, it was ready to enter Cettigne, the capital.

But in spite of the success of the Turks, their difficulties must continue to be as great as ever. With all their great personal qualities, they are ethnically and nationally weak. They cannot give a regular form to their government ; they are still encamped rather than settled in Europe ; they have never been able to assimilate conquered provinces, even when they converted them to their own religion. Hence the rights of the Turks have always been rather defended as mechanically necessary to the balance of power than as defensible by law ; as necessary, but not as legitimate. Hence public sympathy is generally on the side of the insurgent provincials, Christian or Mahometan, and the greatest conservatives are ready to applaud a Servian revolution. On the other hand, the Turk himself cannot, by the law of the Coran, recognise any rights in persons of other religions. He may conclude a truce with them, but not a binding peace. Again, regular government is almost impossible with the sys-



tem of pashas; the continual changes made necessary by the frequent attempts of pashas to make themselves independent, and the consequent lack of interest taken by the governors in their temporary charges; and the selfish interests which replace public ones. The divisions among the Mahometans; the opposition which makes reform impossible, the old school obstructing it through fanaticism, and the Bosnian nobles through interest and unwillingness to sacrifice their privileges; and the existence of the principalities upon the frontier, with their military organisations, especially when exaggerated to such an extent as the Servian militia has been,—all tend to keep the European provinces of Turkey in a state bordering upon insurrection. This is the chronic danger of the Turkish empire.

Both the Montenegrin campaign and the conferences of Constantinople have terminated fortunately for the Porte. On the 6th of September, Omer Pasha, from Scutari, dictated the terms of peace with Montenegro, the heart of all Christian insurrections. The prince of the country has agreed to the Turkish ultimatum, the fourteen articles of which include the banishment of his father Mirko, and the making of two roads through the country; one military, from Spuz in Albania to Niksitch in the Herzegovina, to be guarded by block-houses garrisoned by the Turks; the other commercial, from the Turkish fortress Zabljak to Cettigne; Montenegro is also to be in commercial communication with Albania, the Herzegovina, and Bosnia; but Antivari is to be a free port only for the Montenegrins. Finally, the Porte is to decide in all disputes between the Prince of Montenegro and the neighbouring pashas. Thus the Montenegrins have recognised the Turkish suzerainty. On the 7th of September, the foreign ministers at Constantinople concluded their conferences on Servia. They ended in a compromise, in which the Servians, though discontented with the result, and though energetically supported in their greater demands by the Russian and French ministers, have gained as much as their successes warranted. Servia is not so strong, because not so united, as it was. With the removal of the oppressor, the bond of union has departed. And the Panslavic ideas of the ruling family do not exert much influence on the population. The French *politique d'ostentation* of Milosch necessarily collapses on trial, and a long war would ruin him.

The compromise agreed upon is as follows:—The Turks are to evacuate the suburb of Belgrade, about which the dispute arose; while the citadel itself is to be secured by the enlargement of the glacis. The Turkish and Servian proprietors evicted for these purposes are to be indemnified by their respective governments. Two fortresses held by the Turks in the interior of Servia are to be razed, and the garrisons of the four frontier fortresses reduced to the *minimum* consistent with security. The Servian volunteers are to be dismissed, and the militia reduced to the number required for the police of the principality. The Turks have taken advantage of these successes to rectify some of the causes of trouble in the Herzegovina, and the Eastern question has once more passed out of a phase which was full of menace to the peace of Europe.

In the middle of June, when the heat of the summer warned the armies of the Confederates and the States of North America. Federals to suspend operations, and a long period of comparative repose was expected, the Union was still pursuing the career of success which the battles of Corinth and Winchester had only momentarily interrupted. One large army covered the southern frontier of Tennessee; the valley of Virginia had been re-conquered; and the army which was besieging Richmond was awaiting reinforcements in order to advance. The coast of the Confederate States was in the possession of the Federals; their gunboats commanded all the navigable rivers; and a combined expedition, proceeding from New Orleans and Memphis, for the conquest of Vicksburg, promised to make them masters of the whole course of the Mississippi. The people of the North, encouraged by the progress of their arms and the wonderful display of material resources, were confident of success. Exulting almost alike in the goodness of their cause and in the vast proportions of their enterprise, they bore cheerfully the heavy burdens, the daily inconvenience, and the losses which it imposed. The very magnitude of the sacrifices so patriotically made appeared to justify and sanction the object for which they were offered. It seemed as if ambition, pride, revenge, and the lust of power could have no part in a war which was undertaken against the defenders of slavery, and which elicited among its supporters instances of such magnanimous self-devotion.

The hopes of the Confederates depended on their ability to retard the reinforcement of M'Clellan until they had collected a sufficient force to effect the deliverance of their capital. Whilst the troops of Beauregard hurried over from the West, the appearance of Jackson on the Shenandoah was intended to arrest the march of M'Dowell, and prevent his junction with the grand army before Richmond, until the whole force of the South could be united to overwhelm it. This plan, on which the Confederates relied to repair their losses and achieve their independence, was executed with so much ability, and led to such important results, that it will always be memorable in the annals of war. Four months from the day when Beauregard disappeared from Corinth, and Jackson reached the Potomac; when the movement of concentration, and the diversion by which the enemy was to be divided, were begun,—Virginia was cleared of the invader; and, in two great series of battles, the Federals were repulsed from Richmond, and driven headlong behind the shelter of the fortifications of Washington.

The turning of the tide was on the 16th of June. On that day the Federals attacked the works which protected Charleston, and were defeated after an obstinate struggle. On the 13th, a flying corps of Confederates, passing between the right flank of General M'Clellan and the Pamunkey, had fallen upon the rear of the Federals, and, after inflicting great damage and raising the confidence of one side as much as it dispirited the other, had returned in safety to Richmond. M'Clellan saw that his force was unequal to the work before it, and asked for more troops. But the reinforcements that



reached him were not enough to supply the constant drain caused by an unhealthy position and the home-sickness of his men. The suddenness with which Jackson had fallen on the army of Banks, and the facility with which troops can be moved by rail from Richmond into the valley of Virginia, made the government reluctant to leave the approaches to Washington exposed. The object of Jackson's short campaign was amply gained by the terror he continued to inspire after his retreat.

President Lincoln consulted the governors of the loyal states, and with their concurrence called for 300,000 volunteers. He took counsel with General Scott at West Point, and, on his return to Washington, placed General Pope in command of the united army of Virginia, consisting of the corps of Fremont, Banks, and M'Dowell, in all 75,000 men. With this it was intended that Pope should join in an attack on Richmond, and a part of M'Dowell's force came down the Rappahannock.

Before the junction of the army of Virginia with the army of the Potomac could be effected, the Confederates had completed the concentration of their forces at the decisive point. The object of their operations during a whole month was to gain time for this collecting of their armies. From the moment when it was accomplished, their tactics changed, and they passed from the defensive to the offensive, and gathered by bold and rapid movements the harvest which had ripened by delay. On Wednesday, June the 25th, General Jackson appeared with an overwhelming force behind the right wing of the Federals. General M'Clellan, finding himself outflanked, was compelled to abandon his lines, and retreated to the Chickahominy, pursued by the enemy. On the evening of the 27th, the severest action took place at Gaine's Hill, near the banks of the river. The Federals crossed in the night, and destroyed the bridges, after a loss of above 8000 men, leaving most of their dead and wounded in the hands of the victors. Whilst the Chickahominy covered his army, and saved him from attack, General M'Clellan sent forward his van to take up a position on the James River. The baggage of the army followed, while the main body remained during the 28th on the right bank of the Chickahominy. A great morass, called White-Oak Swamp, occupies the middle space between the two rivers. There was but one road across it by which the Federals could retreat. Their march was necessarily slow, in a long and narrow line; and late on the 29th the Confederates, who had taken a long circuit, in order to find a bridge over the Chickahominy, fell upon their rear. On the 30th, the Federal army had reached the James River, while the rear-guard was engaged with the Confederates at the passage of White-Oak Swamp. The Confederates renewed the attack on other points; but the position of the Federals, under the fire of their gun-boats, could not be forced; and M'Clellan finally entrenched himself at Harrison's Landing, twenty-five miles from the city he had besieged. He had lost 15,200 men, and fifty-three guns; and his army was terribly disorganised. But he had brought it to a place of safety, in the presence of a superior foe; and the successful retreat by a

single road across a morass, and though the forest, explains the confidence he has not lost, and the disappointment of the Southern press at the tardiness of their commanders, whose delay on the 28th enabled him to escape.

When the details of these disastrous battles, and the condition of the army, became known, the spirit of the Northern people quailed, and it was found that the sanguine patriotism which had carried them through so many humiliating reverses had lost its elasticity. According to official returns, 158,000 men had been sent to the army under M'Clellan before the raising of the siege of Richmond. Yet he had not above 100,000 men in line in the battles at the end of June. Ten per cent of the Northern recruits were found unfit for service, and broke down before they reached the seat of war. The numbers on paper supplied by the Secretary of War exceeded by 58,000 the numbers actually received by the commanders in the field. The vast majority of the army had volunteered for a short term only; and independently of the loss caused by the expiration of the terms of service, 123,000 additional recruits would be required to supply the losses caused by the war itself. Of these 34,000 are needed to fill the places of deserters. Meantime, in M'Clellan's army the drain by sickness was greater than the losses by the sword, and the 300,000 twelvemonths' men called for at midsummer failed to appear. The government offered each volunteer a bounty of 8*l.*, which was increased by the public contributions to 50*l.* Still, at the end of July, less than 20,000 men had responded to the call. The confidence in the government and the enthusiasm for the cause were shaken by the disasters and sufferings of the army. More than 700,000 men had already been carried away from the labouring population, while the demand for labour was further increased by the necessity of supplying the army with stores. Nearly one-half of the number consisted of Irish and Germans, who all belong to the working-class, and whose warlike feelings are matter of interest rather than of patriotism. It was expected that they would supply at least three-fourths of the new recruits. The great rise in wages, the approaching harvest, and the increasing horrors of the war, prevailed at last over their devotion to the Union. The government were compelled at length to recur to the threat of conscription. It was proclaimed that a levy of 300,000 men from the militia would be called for on the 15th of August. The term was afterwards fixed for the 1st of September. Signs had already appeared that, though the foreign settlers would serve for pay, they would resent conscription. In July, when the discovery of a Confederate plot at St. Louis induced the governor to call out the militia, great numbers of Irish had claimed exemption as British subjects, and demanded the protection of our consul. When the drafting-order came, thousands fled before it. The Irish, in spite of the exertions of popular officers, such as Meagher and Corcoran, took advantage of their right as foreigners to cross over to the British possessions. The revolutionary party among the Irish hereupon proclaimed as follows:—  
“We are convinced that most of the men who have thus claimed



the protection of the English Government, and who are currently reported to be Irish, are in fact natives of England, and Irish Orangemen, who have always been more English than the English; and the rest of them, though of Irish birth, are but the bastard offspring of English convicts and rebels, who from time to time have settled in Ireland, and assumed Irish names as a cover for their crimes or the baseness of their origin." But to American citizens this right was denied, and stringent measures were taken to prevent the escape of those who were included in the draft. Nearly half of the Maryland contingent disappeared, and in the Far West a formidable excitement arose. In Indiana and in Missouri the people resolved to evade, or, if necessary, to resist, conscription. The Washington government shrank from the danger of a Vendée. The dread of conscription had stimulated voluntary enlistment, and the Secretary of War at last announced that the recruits were in sufficient numbers, and that no compulsory measure would be resorted to. The whole force thus obtained since the battles before Richmond is estimated at about 200,000 men.

The real and significant response to the Southern victories is less in the material preparations than in the movement of opinion in the North. The government of the Republican President stands between two parties, the Abolitionists and the Democrats, and is compelled to make overtures to both. The proposal for the gradual redemption of slaves was acceptable to neither. The President told the men of the Border States, to whom it was submitted, and who hold in their hands the issue of the war, that it was no coercive measure, but that it was necessary in order to relieve him from the increasing pressure of the Abolitionists. Twenty delegates from Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, and Missouri, replied that they were determined indeed to uphold the Union, but that it would be unjust to impose on them burdens from which they might escape by secession, and to mulct them for the sake of their Abolitionist enemies. They refused to consider any scheme of emancipation until money had been voted by Congress for the purpose, and they gave no hopes that it could even then be entertained. But they did not insist on the necessity of preserving slavery. They denounced the project of causing the slaves to rise against the rebels, and they declared the fanaticism of the Abolitionists to be the real cause of secession. "Satisfy the Southern people that no war is made on their property and rights, and they would return to their allegiance." The present governor of Kentucky convened the legislature to consider the acts of Congress respecting slavery; and the late governor, Wickliffe, publicly declared that the Union could only be preserved by putting down the Abolitionists and abandoning the policy of emancipation and confiscation. With these feelings, the Border States were naturally remiss in supplying volunteers. Delaware, Kentucky, and Missouri, as well as Maryland, exhibited as much disinclination to enlist as to submit to conscription. The Democrats hope for the support of a very large section of the Irish Catholics, and are ready to make considerable concessions to obtain it. The feeling which this excites in the Abolitionists appears in

the words of a Northern writer:—"We have no defence to offer for what is wrong in our treatment of the Negro race, except to state the single fact, that the people here who are most cruel and ungenerous in their dealings with the blacks are the Irish. It is the Irish Roman Catholic vote on which the Democratic leaders at the North are relying as their main strength in the coming elections; and no effort is spared by these leaders to pander to the base prejudice of which I have spoken." Another correspondent says:—"The Abolitionists are, for the most part, Unitarians and Presbyterians, and the Roman Catholic clergy do not stand on the same platform with them either in religion or in philanthropy, and share to a large extent the American prejudice against Negroes, as well as the social dislike entertained for them by the Irish working-classes on the question of wages."

The Irish hate slavery, and dislike the Negroes, for the same reason. They are excluded by the slave from a profitable market for their labour. Their antagonism even with the free black in the North is producing almost a war of race between them. The hatred of slavery makes a portion of them eager for the war. In addition to this, there is gratitude to the Federal government for the protection they have received, and some attachment to it as the rival of England. There is also something which attracts them in an intelligent popular despotism. It is the form of government which thousands of Irish have wished for at home, to deliver them from a system which converted even the forms of freedom into an instrument of oppression. To those in whom aversion for England is the predominant sentiment, the cause of the Union is as the cause of their country. On the other hand, the influence of the clergy necessarily modifies the Abolitionist feeling in the North, just as it checks the evils of slavery in the South. To join the cry for abolition would be to preach a crusade against the Church in the Confederacy. The Catholics may join with ardour in the political arguments of the North, but they cannot be with the extreme party. They have not condemned the war, but they have not, as a body, taken part in its excesses. This has been the conduct of the foremost person among them, the Archbishop of New York. When he was in Ireland, at the end of July, he expressed views on insurrection of which every Irishman could make the application. The chief condition, he said, necessary to justify it is, next to real oppression, the prospect of success. If, therefore, Ireland would have been justified in rebelling by a reasonable probability of success, it is hard to condemn the Southern States for their successful attempt to dissolve a league. The Archbishop has taken care to counteract the practical effect of this theory by the most urgent support of the war for preventing the dissolution of the Union.

The Border States are no longer the only part of the Union which the President is obliged to conciliate, or which is able to hold defiant or menacing language. If the question of slavery puts them in an anomalous position towards the government of the United States, the financial question operates to nearly the same extent on the West. Whilst the South fights for independence in order to secure State rights in regard to slavery and taxation, the West is as



much interested in one cause as the Border States in the other. The enormous corn-lands on the Upper Mississippi require all the facilities for export which the water communications of the continent supply. On the one hand, they have the lakes and the St. Lawrence; on the other the Mississippi; on either hand free trade. The North offers them a protective tariff instead. Their material interests separate them, therefore, as much from the North as their hatred of slavery from the South; and the defeat of McClellan brought this difference powerfully before them. The revival of the democratic party in the West was apparent in the State Convention of Iowa. That assembly condemned the Tariff and the Tax Bill as injurious to their interests, which require the free exchange of their agricultural produce for British manufactures. They denounced the efforts of the Abolitionists as the real cause of the war, and asserted that the constitution of the United States was established for white men only. They further declared that the arbitrary measures of the ministry were contrary to law; that the constitutional rights of the people could never be suspended; and that the means by which the government were endeavouring to save the Union were dangerous to civil freedom. A secret society was formed in Illinois to resist these encroachments, and it spread rapidly in the West. Thus the platform of the Democrats in the West and on the Border substantially agreed. The Democratic party in the North-eastern States could not declare their opinions with the same security. The prisons were filled with men arbitrarily arrested on suspicion of disloyalty, and the government kept down with a strong hand every sign of opposition. Nevertheless, as the party grew stronger by the reverses of the campaign, it was determined at length to set up the standard of an organised resistance to the war policy of the Republicans. On the 23d of August a great popular meeting was held at Philadelphia, in which the government and the war were vehemently denounced. The most violent speaker, Mr. Ingersoll, was arrested; but the right of free speech was vindicated, and the existence of a powerful opposition became a public certainty.

These manifestations of opinion exasperated the party against which they were directed. The military reverses, instead of uniting the North as heretofore, impelled the parties to opposite extremes, and embittered the absolute adversaries of slavery as much as they disposed the political advocates of war to prefer conciliatory measures. The general tone of the Abolitionists may be gathered from the language of the Philadelphia correspondent of an English clerical journal of the highest character:—"General Butler meanwhile rules at New Orleans with firmness and wisdom. His severity is not a particle more than is required. No weak regard for human life hinders him from doing his whole duty in making secure the national rule in the city. . . . With regard to General Butler's rule in New Orleans, great satisfaction is felt by the country. . . . The good-humour, but at the same time the decision and energy, with which Butler acts make him the man of all others for the position." (*The Guardian*, July 9 and 16.)

It has now become the wish of a very large party that the slaves should be emancipated by proclamation; and while some are busily urging the President to take this step, others denounce him for not taking it. The latter view was strongly expressed by the Abolitionist orator Mr. Wendell Phillips, in a speech delivered in celebration of the anniversary of the emancipation of the West-India slaves. He said:—"The government fights to preserve slavery, and therefore it fights in vain. Mr. Lincoln is waging a political war. It is politics that stand out in every act of Mr. Lincoln and his generals. . . . . The present war, conducted without a reasonable object, is a total loss of blood and treasure. Better the South should go to-day than lose another life to prolong the war upon the present detestable policy. . . . . We have the South by the ears, and we can neither hold on nor let her go. Let her go to-morrow, and you will have no peace. . . . . We shall never have peace until slavery is destroyed. . . . Jefferson Davis's successes are far greater than he anticipated; and if he can possibly float upon them and a few more, thus holding his own to the 4th of March 1863, England will, as she ought to, recognise the Southern Confederacy. . . . . Let this Union be dissolved, in God's name, and the corner-stone of a new one be laid, on which shall be engraved for ever, 'Equality in a political sense for every man who is born in the world.' . . . . Wickliffe and Davis of Kentucky can put their foot down and say to the President, 'Do this, or the Border States will leave you;' but no Republican can put his foot down and say, 'Do this, or the North will leave you.' . . . . . God has placed in the hands of President Lincoln the thunderbolt of slavery to crush this rebellion, but he will not use it."

The speaker then commended the example of French democracy, where the State has power to impose its will without attending to contradictory opinions. This is the language of a consistent fanaticism. Mr. Phillips deems the moral duty of crushing slavery superior to the political objects of the State, and is ready therefore to sacrifice the Union to emancipation.

Words more violent, though not more extravagant, were used at a war meeting held at Washington on the 6th of August, at which the President spoke in defence of Mr. Stanton and General M'Clellan. The following resolutions were passed:—

"Let the Union be preserved or the country made a desert. . . . . If at the present time there is any hesitation among the people of the loyal States in devoting themselves and their property to the cause of the country, it arises from the misgivings as to the manner of prosecuting the war, and in the apprehension that there is a want of readiness on the part of those who direct the military operations, whether in the cabinet or in the field, to employ at once the full power of the nation, which all know to be overwhelming.

"We therefore urge the President to take means to assure the people that he is resolved to prosecute the war on a scale limited only by the resources of the country. We hail with joy the recent order directing immediate drafts. We are convinced that the leaders of the rebellion will never turn to their allegiance, and therefore they



should be regarded and treated as irreclaimable traitors, who are to be stripped of their possessions and deprived of their lives, or expelled from the country."

At New York resolutions were passed at a meeting of leading citizens, declaring it better that every rebel should perish than one loyal man. They demanded an act of emancipation. "This," they said, "will diminish the rebel army, by calling many rebel officers and men to the defence of their homes. The free States and the whole civilised world will applaud the emancipation proclamation."

It must be remembered, to the honour of Mr. Lincoln, that he has never made himself the instrument of the factions that surround him, or forgotten the dictates of policy or of duty. He acts as the representative of the Union under the old constitution. That constitution did not provide sufficient securities for the freedom of the people, or for the emancipation of the slaves; and great reforms were needed in order that the republic should vindicate the theories of democracy. A man of genius might have projected those reforms; and yet it is doubtful whether they could ever have been accomplished without convulsions. Mr. Lincoln is not equal to that enterprise; but if he could not remodel, he has earnestly endeavoured to maintain, the law. In reply to the reproaches of Mr. Horace Greeley, he wrote, on the 22d of August, the following significant words:—"As to the policy I 'seem to be pursuing,' as you say, I have not meant to leave any one in doubt. I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the constitution. The sooner the national authority can be restored, the nearer the Union will be 'the Union as it was.' If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time *save* slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time *destroy* slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount object in this struggle *is* to save the Union, and is *not* either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing *any* slave, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing *all* the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the coloured race, I do because I believe it helps to save this Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do *not* believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do *less* whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause; and I shall do *more* whenever I shall believe that doing more will help the cause. I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors; and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views."

Between those who are ready to sacrifice the Union to the extinction of slavery, and those who would extricate the rebels to save the Northern cause, there is room for a third opinion. The idea that the Union ought to be saved at any price is but a step beyond the platform of the Democrats. To those who are neither Abolitionists nor Republicans, and who are hostile to the policy of the government, it must be apparent that they are struggling only to preserve the Union; that their one object is the greatness of America; and

that they are upholding national aims,—not a particular doctrine of morality, or a particular theory of government. They may consent to the maintenance of slavery ; they may accept the claim of State rights as a wholesome restraint on the supreme authority and the sovereign will ; and they may be ready to sacrifice the government of Mr. Lincoln. It would not be wonderful if, in minds of this stamp, during the lull of military ardour, or the reaction of disappointment, the idea should find place that there is yet a way of restoring the union of the States, and of recovering far more than their former prosperity and splendour. To an American who is a patriot rather than a partisan, the contrast between the waste of enormous resources in the North, and the prodigious energy with which the Southern statesmen have created and used their materials, must suggest a doubt on which side are the best rulers and the ablest commanders for the future republic. The Southern statesmen have not only displayed the rarest wisdom in their policy ; but they have corrected some of the acknowledged defects of the Federal constitution, and they have improved its spirit more than they have altered its text. If their triumph should not only lead to their recognition, but to the restoration of the Union on the basis of a limited central authority, and of such independent rights in the several States as would prevent either the manufacturing or the agricultural interest from being sacrificed to the will of a majority,—the people of the North might willingly acknowledge in Mr. Jefferson Davis the successor of Washington. Some indications there are already of the dawning of this idea. The routed soldiers of the Union appeared at Arlington, cheering for “old Jeff Davis ;” and in the Northern cities Stonewall Jackson is the national hero. If they display as much moderation in victory as constancy under defeat, and prove themselves not less generous as invaders than heroic in the defence of their soil, the Confederates may cultivate admiration into enthusiasm, and use those feelings with great effect in establishing the independence and the limits of their power.

On the 18th of August, the Confederate Congress met at Richmond, and the President’s message contained certain passages which betray somewhat of the character of his government:—

“The acts passed at your last session intended to secure the public defence by general enrolment, and to render uniform the rules governing troops in the service, have led to some unexpected criticism that is much to be regretted. . . .

“And if any legislation shall seem to you appropriate for adjusting differences of opinion, it will be my pleasure as well as duty to coöperate in any measure that may be devised for reconciling a just care for the public defence with a proper deference for the most scrupulous susceptibilities of the State authorities. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury will exhibit in detail the operations of that department. It will be seen with satisfaction that the credit of the government securities remains unimpaired, and that this credit is fully justified by the comparatively small amount of accumulated debt, notwithstanding the magnitude of our military operations. . . .

“In connection with this subject, I am of opinion that prudence



dictates some provision for the increase of the army, in the event of emergencies not now anticipated. The very large increase of forces recently called into the field by the President of the United States may render it necessary hereafter to extend the provisions of the conscript law, so as to embrace persons between the ages of thirty-five and forty-five years. The vigour and efficiency of our present forces, their condition, and the skill and ability which distinguish their leaders, inspire the belief that no further enrolment will be necessary; but a wise foresight requires that, if a necessity should be suddenly developed during the recess of Congress, requiring increased forces for our defence, means should exist for calling such forces into the field without awaiting the re-assembling of the legislative department of the government. In the election and appointment of officers for the provisional army, it was to be anticipated that mistakes would be made, and incompetent officers of all grades introduced into the service. In the absence of experience, and with no reliable guide for selection, executive appointments, as well as elections, have been sometimes unfortunate. The good of the service, the interests of our country, require that some means be devised for withdrawing the commissions of officers who are incompetent for the duties required by their position; and I trust that you will find means for relieving the army of such officers by some mode more prompt and less wounding to their sensibility than judgment of a court-martial. . . .

"I am happy to inform you, that, in spite of both blandishments and threats, used in profusion by the agents of the government of the United States, the Indian nations within the Confederacy have remained firm in their loyalty, and steadfast in the observance of their treaty engagements with this government. Nor has their fidelity been shaken by the fact that, owing to the vacancies in some of the offices of agents and superintendents, delay has occurred in the payments of the annuities and allowances to which they are entitled."

Several bills were immediately laid upon the table. One extended the application of the conscript act from the age of thirty-five to that of forty-five. Another provided that all white officers taken when in command of slaves should be liable to be hung or shot, and the slaves returned to their owners. Another bill gave the government power to raise 250,000 men. With these measures the Confederate government intended to provide against the increased force which the recent call of 300,000 men would give to the Northern armies later in the year. But they relied still more on the vigorous pursuit of the campaign to give them victory before the preparations of the North could be completed, or the new army organised.

During the hot weather of July, the Federals were not active in the field. On the 24th, it was announced that the supreme command had been given to General Halleck. On the 23d, General Pope issued an order threatening the severest penalties to all disloyal persons. Shortly after this he took the field with an army which had been reinforced by the arrival of General Burnside from Newport News at Fredericksburg. The Federals held the line of the Rappahannock, which covers to the south the famous heights of

Manassas. On the 5th of August, a simultaneous movement was made by M'Clellan in the direction of Richmond, and by Pope against the railway by which the Confederate communications were maintained between Richmond and central Virginia. The repulse of M'Clellan at Malvern Hill terminated his inglorious campaign. Pope manœuvred for several days against the Confederates, who had crossed the Rapidan to meet him; and on the 9th General Banks was defeated at Cedar Mountain, with a loss of 1500 men.

On the 16th of August, General M'Clellan evacuated his position at Harrison's Bend, and began to transport his army to Acquia Creek, in order to unite with Pope and Burnside in an advance from the north. This movement, which was not molested by the enemy, necessarily took some time. The army had no sooner disappeared from the peninsula, than the Confederates threw themselves on Pope, hoping to overwhelm him before M'Clellan arrived. On the 17th and 18th, Pope succeeded in withdrawing his whole army across the Rappahannock, and for several days that river separated the two armies on a line of fifteen miles, and concealed their movements from each other. General Lee occupied the Federals in front, whilst Jackson, passing through the mountains, came down on the 29th of August on the flank of Pope. Here, on the old battle-field of Bull Run, the Federals were once more beaten. On the following day, August 30th, a pitched battle was fought at Centreville between Pope and Lee. The Confederate general gained a complete victory; and on the 2d of September the whole Federal army had retired with great loss behind the fortifications of Washington.

In the west the Confederates had been almost equally successful. Van Dorn forced the enemy to raise the siege of Vicksburg, and Breckenridge took Baton Rouge. The Mississippi was once more in the power of the South. In Kentucky a guerrilla war was carried on during the summer, until the Confederate forces united, gained a victory at Richmond, in the north-western extremity of the state, and approached its northern boundary, threatening the great cities of Louisville and Cincinnati. The territory of the Union was thus open to invasion on the Potomac and the Ohio.

On the 5th of September, the army of General Jackson poured into Maryland near Leesburg, between Washington and Harper's Ferry, and occupied Frederic. He marched northwards, along the eastern slope of the Blue Ridge at the boundary of Pennsylvania. On the 7th, his troops were at Westminster. They were well received in a country abounding with Southern feeling long kept under by force. The discipline and orderly conduct of the men, who found themselves, after long privations and toils, in a land of plenty, and the care with which the officers caused every thing to be paid for, made the Confederate army appear as deliverers. General M'Clellan, having superseded Halleck in the supreme command, led forth the whole available forces of the Union against Jackson, and a new campaign began for the possession of Maryland.



# INDEX.

- ADVENTURERS, political, described, 32  
 Æneas Sylvius, quoted, 80  
 Æschylus, Choëphoræ, Davies' edition of, noticed, 236  
 Africa, savage tribes of: Hottentot tribes, 130; Caffre tribes, 131; tribes of the Usagara, 132; Wasagara, ib.; Ugogo, ib.; Unyamwezi, ib.; coast tribes, 132, 133; Fans, &c., 133; commercial propensity of, 145  
 Agrarian crime in Munster, Current Events, 569  
 Agrarian outrage in Ireland, Current Events, 258  
 Alaux, M., on Hayti, 382-386  
 Albert, Charles, 13  
 Alexander I. (emperor), 101  
 Alexander VI., Pope, 361  
 Alexander VII., Pope, 150, 153, 154  
 Alliance, the Holy, its policy, 11 sqq.  
 Alphabets, 176  
 Amalfi, code of, 339  
 Amazons of Dahomey, 142  
 America, confederacy in, 6; influence of its example on England in 1862, 37; contrast between Northern and Western States, &c., 112; Border States, 113; Abolitionism of Western States, 116, Current Events, 278, 598-608  
 Amiot, Father, 447  
 Ampère, L'Histoire Romaine à Rome, noticed, 529  
 Amsterdam, 6  
 Annales Ferdinandeï (Khevenhiller's), 88  
 Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, quoted, 137  
 Ardouin, M., Etudes sur l'Histoire d'Hayti, referred to, 363  
 Aristocracy, English, took the side of Austria in 1859, 36  
 Arlington, Lord, 148, 166, 170, 171  
 Arnould, Sir J., on the Law of Marine Insurance and Average, reviewed, 335-359  
 Arundell, Lord, 170  
 Aryas, the, 449  
 Assessment of general average, principles of, 347-355  
 Ateliers de charité, 328-334  
 Athens, 6  
 Aubigny, Ludovick Stuart, Lord, 148-152; made Cardinal, 153  
 Auckland, Lord, the Journal and Correspondence of William (first), noticed, 243  
 Austria, 12, 13; policy of, in Italy, 15; problem of government of, 22; the bulwark of Germany, 90  
 Average, general: meaning of the word, 338; proposed international code of, 337  
 Azzolini, Cardinal, 151  
 BAADER, 545  
 Baily, L. R., General Average, reviewed, 335-360  
 Balmez, 513  
 Baring, Mr., 36  
 Basil, peace of, 1795, 100  
 Bayou, the master of Toussaint, 368  
 Baxter, 153  
 Beaumont, Gustave de, on Ireland, quoted, 289-292  
 Beckmann, Zur Geschichte des Kopernikanischen Systems, noticed, 240  
 Belgium, Current Events, 580-590  
 Bellings, Sir Richard, his mission to Rome, 151-153, 170  
 Beneke, 342-344  
 Bennet, see Arlington.  
 Bentinck, Mr., 36  
 Beresford, 306, 307  
 Bernard of Saxe Weimar, 87  
 Bernard, Dr., 303  
 Bernstorff, Count, 109  
 Beust, Baron, 109  
 Biassou, General, 369  
 Biot, M., 431, 443, 447  
 Blomfield, Dr., 525  
 Boero, Father, Mss. furnished by, 169  
 Bonald, 513  
 Bossuet, on love of country, 21 (note)  
 Bourbons, the French, 5; the Spanish, ib.  
 Bourne, A Memoir of Sir Philip Sidney, noticed, 242  
 Bowyer, Sir George, 39  
 Boyer, president of Hayti, 382

- Brandenburg, House of, its rise, 91  
 Bright, Mr. 35  
 Bristol, Lord, 148, 151  
 Brodie, Sir B., Psychological Inquiries, noticed, 248  
 Browne, J., Fabric Rolls and Documents of York Minster, noticed, 536  
 Buccaneers, the 362  
 Buckingham, 170  
 Bunsen, Baron, 420-424  
 Burchell, Dr., Travels in South Africa, quoted, 183  
 Bureaux de bienfaisance, 320; statistics of, 324; receipts of, 326; rules of, 327; organisation of, in Paris, 329-331  
 Burke, Edmund, 5; quoted, 20, 305-307  
 Burke, R. O'Hara, and Australian exploration, 559  
 Burnet, 148, 149  
 Burton, 131; his Lake Regions of Central Africa, quoted, 132, 135, 136, 137, 143, 144  
 Bushe, Chief-Justice, cited, 304, 305  
  
 CÆSAR, 9  
 Callimachus, 524  
 Camden, Lord, 307  
 Campbell, L., his edition of Plato's Theætetus, noticed, 522  
 Canada, 311  
 Carbonari, 12  
 Cardinal Wiseman and the Home and Foreign Review, 501  
 Careil, M. Foucher de, Œuvres de Leibniz, noticed, 543  
 Carnot, Mémoires sur, by his son, noticed, 548  
 Carte, quoted, 149  
 Casalis, The Basutos, quoted, 131, 134, 135, 136, 140, 141  
 Catherine II., 97, 98  
 Catholic priesthood in Ireland, power of, 309  
 Celtic race, 304  
 Cerne, Book of, 473  
 Champollion, 421  
 Charier, Abbé, 150  
 Charity, compulsory, M. Block's objections to, 314-318  
 Charity, Sisters of, in France, 333  
 Charles I., 79; letter to Queen Henrietta, 147  
 Charles II., 146; his attitude to the English Catholics, and religious character, 152, 153, 415; his conversion, 164, 320  
 Charles V. (emperor), 82-84; Commentaries of, noticed, 541  
 Charles VI. (emperor), 92  
 Charles X., treaty with Hayti, 383  
 Charles XII., 91  
 Chemnitz, 88  
 Chigi, Cardinal, 151  
 China, chronology of, 442-448  
 Choisy, Abbé de, 172  
 Christian, king of Denmark, 86  
 Christina, queen of Sweden, 151, 157  
 Christophe, governor of Hayti, 380; king, 381; his death, 382  
 Church, English established, tends to alliance of Toryism and Radicalism, 48  
 Church-rates, element of conservative reaction, 38  
 Church, the Catholic, 4; position of, in Ireland, 75, 309; ethical and intellectual offices of, 511  
 Circumcision among the Caffres, 142  
 Clarendon, 147; quoted, 148, 151  
 Clement IX, Pope, 157, 166, 172  
 Clervaux, 371  
 Clifford, 148  
 Cloche, de la, Mr. 156  
 Cloche, James de la du Bourg, alias James Stuart, 146, 156; the eldest son of Charles II., 156; conversion of, 157; becomes a Jesuit, ib.; visits his father, 159; conjectural history of, 164, 166, 167.  
 Clovis, 9  
 Cobden, Mr., 35; his review of the state of parties, Current Events, 563  
 Colbert, ambassador in England, 170, 171  
 Coleman's letter to La Chaise, 173  
 Columbus, his discovery of St Domingo, 361  
 Confucius, 444  
 Conne, 152  
 Conservative Reaction, 26  
 Consolato del Mare, 347  
 Copernicus, 240  
 Corona, Teresa, 161  
 Cortes, Donoso, 513  
 Cosnac, Dan. de, 171  
  
 DANTON, 92  
 D'Argens, 95  
 Darnell, Mr., his translation of Dörlinger's Heathenism, &c., 450  
 Daun, Marshal, 95, 103  
 Davies, the Choëphoræ of Æschylus, and Scholia, noticed, 236  
 Debate on expenditure, June 4, Current Events, 257  
 Deer, Gospels of, 484  
 Dépôts de mendicité, 328  
 Dessalines, General, 371; governor-general of Hayti, 378; his death, 380  
 D'Estrées, Cardinal, 166  
 Digby, Lady Diana, 172



- Digby, see Bristol.  
 Diplomatic statesmen described, 29  
 Disraeli, Mr., character of, 32; speech, May 8, 1862, 44; his speech on armaments, *Current Events*, 255; real meaning of his speech, *ib.*, 256  
 Doctrinaires, half-, 29  
 Doctrinaires, their political system, 27  
 Dod, 147, 151  
 Döllinger on Heathenism and Judaism, 450  
 Dominican republic, account of, 388-391  
 Droysen, Dr. G. 106, 107  
 Du Chaillu, Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa, quoted, 133, 136, 137, 143, 144  
 Dupin, *Mémoires de*, noticed, 550
- EARLIEST Epochs of authentic chronology, the, 420  
 Echard, quoted, 149  
 Eckstein, the Baron d', 449  
 Educational Code, the revised, *Current Events*, 251  
 Edwards, Bryan, 362, 363, 365  
 Egypt, chronology of, 421-442; three periods of, 434  
 Elizabeth, Queen, 320  
 Emancipation Act, legislative results of, 56, 199  
 Emérigon, 340  
 England, 4; alliance with France, 393  
 European system, the old, 4  
 Evangelistic Symbols as a key to the Gospels, the, 195  
 Exodus, the date of the, investigated, 435-439
- FAMINE, Irish, in 1847, 293, 294  
 Farrar on the Origin of Language, reviewed, 175 sqq.  
 Fénelon on reading the Scriptures, quoted, 532  
 Fetishism, African, account of, 133-141  
 Feudalism, 9  
 Fitzgerald, Mr. Seymour, 36  
 Fitzwilliam, Lord, 305, 306  
 Fleming, Southern Africa, quoted, 130, 134, 135, 142  
 Forbes, Commissioner, Dahomey and the Dahomans, quoted, 133, 139, 142, 144  
 Fournel, V., *La Littérature indépendante et les Ecrivains oubliés*, noticed, 542.  
 Fox on Charles II., 146  
 France, the Revolution of 1789, 6  
 Francis I., 82, 320
- Frederick of Hohenzollern, Burgrave of Nuremberg, 91  
 Frederick I., 91  
 Frederick II., 92, 94; puts an end to all hopes of reunion of the churches in Germany, 94; identifies Prussia with Protestantism, 95; forges a letter from the Pope to Marshal Daun, 95; his historical writings, *ib.*; his use of war, 97  
 Frederick William I., 91  
 Frederick William II., 98, 99  
 Frederick William III., 101  
 Frederick William IV., 105  
 Frederick William of Brandenburg, 89, 91
- GAGARIN, Father, *Ceuvres choisies de Pierre Tchadaïeff*, noticed, 551  
 Galileo, 240  
 Garcia, Don, 370  
 Garibaldi, expedition of, against Rome, *Current Events*, 590  
 Gaubil, Father, 443, 445  
 Gaul, Roman, 9  
 Geffrard, General 384, 387  
 General Average, 335, &c.  
 George III., 101, 307  
 George IV., 305  
 Germanic modification of Western Europe, 8  
 Germany, 5; historical literature of, affected by party spirit, 79; position of, before and since the Reformation, *ib.* sqq.; Thirty Years' War, 55 sqq.  
 Germany and France, 83  
 Giudici, Father, 161  
 Gladstone, Mr., 28; his speech at Manchester, April 24, 1862, 42, and in *Current Events*, 253  
 Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, 357,  
 Görres, 10  
 Goldwin-Smith, Mr., on Ireland, 303, &c.  
 Gospels, characteristics of the, 205, &c.  
 Gotha Party, office of, 93; historical school of, 96; its strength among the professors, 104; its object, *ib.*; origin of name, 105, 106  
 Grattan, 305, 306  
 Greece, 6  
 Gregory, Mr. 37  
 Greswell, Dr., his chronology, 420  
 Guhl and Koner, *Das Leben der Griechen und Römer nach antiken Bildwerken*, noticed, 527  
 Guizot, M., 28  
 Gustavus Adolphus, 86, 92  
 Gustavus Wasa, 81  
 Guy Joly, *Mémoires*, quoted, 151

- HABSBURG, the, 5; peculiar character of, 82  
Halde, Father du, 447  
Halifax, quoted, 146  
Hallam, 146, 160  
Hanseatic League, 339  
Harris, Life of Charles II., quoted, 161  
Haugwitz, Count, 100  
Häusser, 107  
Hayti, 361  
Hecker, Father, Sermons preached at the church of St. Paul, New York, noticed, 249  
Hédouville, General, 370  
Hennessy, Mr., 39  
Henrietta, duchess of Orleans, 171  
Henrietta Maria, queen, 147, 152  
Henry II. (of France), 84, 321  
Henry IV. (of France), 79, 82, 85  
Henry VIII., 81, 154  
Hesse Cassel, Landgravine of, 87  
Hessian Constitution, the, Current Events, 273  
Hohenzollern, the, 5  
Holland, 5  
Holland, Sir Henry, Essays on scientific and other subjects, noticed, 249  
Home and Foreign Review, principles of, 510-520  
Homer, quoted, 137; translations of, noticed, 226-232; Köchly's edition of, noticed, 232-236  
Hopkins, M., Handbook of Average, reviewed, 335, &c.  
Horace, Peerkamp's edition of, noticed, 238  
Horsman, Mr., 37, 45, 47  
Hubbard, Mr., 36  
Huddleston, Father, 164  
Hugo, Victor, *Les Misérables*, reviewed, 392; his family, *ib.*; his early romances, 393; the key to his poetry, &c., 394; his romanticism, 395; his vagueness, 397; his religion, 398; analysis of *Les Misérables*, 400-411; object of the book, 411; his style, 412-416; his socialism, 416  
Hülkamp and Rump, *Literarischer Handweiser für das Katholische Deutschland*, noticed, 561  
Hutchinson, Ten years' Wanderings among the Ethiopians, quoted, 139, 144  
INDIES, the, 5  
Intolerance in Ireland, 306  
Ireland, agrarian outrage in, Current Events, 258, 569; government of, *ib.*, 262; Perraud on, reviewed, 289 sqq.; Gustave de Beaumont's prophesy on, 289-292; its entire failure, 291-295; Ireland politically weaker, socially stronger than in 1837, 295; its three main evils,—divided political interests, political weakness, and social antagonisms, 296; political equality in, 298; police, 299; poor-laws, *ib.*; judges, *ib.*; administration of justice, 300-303; Mr. Goldwin Smith on, 304; historical causes of its political insignificance, 304-307; consequences of the policy of 1795-1800, 307-309; political power of the Catholic priesthood in, 309; Church establishment, 310; probable consequences of an invasion of, 311; Catholic university in, Current Events, 567  
Ireland, the element it contributes to the conservative reaction, 39; its relation to England, 52 sqq.; changes in, since 1829, 55; coercion laws of, 57-64; laws against Orange supremacy in, 64-66; political changes of law in, 66-74  
Irish bishops' (Catholics) declaration against the Protestant establishment, 46  
Irish government, position of, Current Events, 262  
Italy, 5; revolution of, 38;  
JACKSON, Andrew, Robert O'Hara Burke, and the Australian exploring expedition of 1860, noticed, 559  
Jermyn, 147, 148  
Jesuits, Charles II. and the, 152, 153  
Jettison, 341-346  
Joachim of Brandenburg, 83, 91  
John Frederick of Saxony, 83, 84  
John, St., characteristics of, 211  
Joseph II. (emperor), 97  
Jubainville, M., *Histoire des Ducs et des Comtes de Champagne*, noticed, 538  
Juries, 302, 303  
Jurisprudence, the Roman, 9; maritime, 337 sqq.  
Justice, administration of, in Ireland, 301, &c.  
Juvenal, 526  
Juxon, 173  
KAUNITZ, 96  
Kenrick, Archbishop, his translation of the New Testament from the Latin Vulgate, noticed, 530  
Kent, Chancellor, 343  
Kenyon, Lord, 342  
Khevenhill, Count, 88



Klopp, O., 106  
 Knox, George, 305  
 Köchly, Iliadis Carmina XVI. Scholarum in usum restituta, noticed, 232  
 Koner, see Guhl  
 Korybuth, Michael, king of Poland, 168  
  
 LA COLOMBIERE, 165  
 Lacroix, 371  
 Lamennais, 513  
 Lancashire, distress in, Current Events, 252  
 Language, origin of, theories on, 177-182; stages of, 183, &c.; roots of, 185-190; derivations in, 191; word-clipping, 191; slang, 193  
 Las-Casas, 361  
 Lasteyrie, Jules de, quoted, 304  
 Latin Europe, 9  
 Laveaux, 369  
 Leclerc, General, 373  
 Leibniz, 91; quoted, 106; M. Foucher de Careil's edition of, noticed, 543  
 Leopold (emperor), 91, 98, 99  
 Lettenhove, Baron Kervyn de, Commentaires de Charles V, noticed, 540  
 Lewis, St., 320  
 Lewis XIV., 79, 89, 90, 162, 166, 170  
 Lewis, Sir G. C., Astronomy of the Ancients, 421-424  
 Lingard, 147; quoted, 152, 473  
 Lister, Life of Clarendon, quoted, 148  
 Livingstone, Dr., 130; his Missionary Travels in South Africa, quoted, 131, 134, 141  
 Lloyds', the committee of, 357  
 Lucas, Frederick, biography of, 552  
 Lucretius, quoted, 182  
 Luke, St., characteristics of, 208  
 Luther, 81, 82  
  
 MACAULAY, quoted, 79, 80, 147  
 Machiavelli, Frederick II. writes against, 92  
 Mackintosh, 146  
 Maistre, De, on nationality 10 (note), 513, 514  
 Maitland, General, 369  
 Malmesbury, Lord, 36  
 Manetho, 422, 429, 430  
 Manuscripts at Cambridge, 471  
 Maria Theresa, 92  
 Mariette, M., 428, 433  
 Maritime codes, English and foreign, compared, 355  
 Mark, St., characteristics of, 207  
 Martineau, Miss, her estimate of Toussaint Louverture, 374-377  
 Maskell, Mr., 473

Mathew, Father, his movement, 295, 296  
 Mathias, 85  
 Matter, M., Saint-Martin, le Philosophe inconnu, noticed, 545  
 Matthew, St., characteristics of, 205  
 Maurice of Saxony, 83; his treason, 84  
 Maximilian I. (emperor), 81  
 Mazarin, 88, 148, 150, 151  
 Mazzini, the apostle of nationality, 14  
 Meineke, Callimachi Cyrenensis Hymni et Epigrammata, noticed, 524  
 Mentz, elector of, 89  
 Metternich: how promoter of the theory of nationality, 13  
 Missal, peculiar, of 14th century, 495  
 Moise, General, 371  
 Monmouth, Duke of, 146, 159  
 Montagu, Lord R., 47  
 Montalembert, Count de, 513  
 Montégut, Emile, quoted, 304  
 Montpensier, Madlle. de, 147  
 Mordaunt, 158  
 Moréri, quoted, 153  
 Mortimer-Ternaux, Histoire de la Terreur, 1792-1794, noticed, 547  
 Müller, Max, reviewed, 175 sqq.  
 Murray, the Iliad, Book I., in English hexameters according to quantity, noticed, 226

NATIONALITY, a political idea, 1; because it joins a new notion of happiness with the sense of present evil, 2; a general principle of change, not a particular principle of revolt against given grievances, 3; its necessity, *ib.*; its justice, 4; unknown to the old European system, 6; arose from the partition of Poland, *ib.*; its alliance with revolution, 7; necessary for the unity of modern France, *ib.*; sprang from the rejection of the state, and of history, 8; commoner among Latin than Teutonic populations, because only in the former is there an alien dominant class to expel, 9; corresponds with the Gaulish idea of equality, 10; not an element in the calculations of Napoleon I., 11; entirely ignored at the Congress of Vienna, and opposed by the Holy Alliance, 12; reappears in the Polish, Belgian, and Greek revolutions, and the opposition to Metternich, 14; its development traced in the life of Mazzini, 15; how influenced by the revolution of 1848, *ib.*; comparison of the two

- views of nationality,—the French and the English, 17; political necessity of fusion of races in one state, 18; religious aspects of this fusion, 19; nationality and patriotism contrasted, 22; impotence of patriotism founded solely on nationality, *ib.*; nationality retrograde; it is impossible, and marks the logical exhaustion of the revolutionary doctrine, 24, 25
- Nationalverein, 99, 108
- Napoleon I. promotes the feeling of nationality by ignoring its rights, 10, 13; his relations with Prussia in 1805, 100; with Hayti, 372–374
- Napoleon III., 107, 303
- Netherlands, revolt of, 2; confederacy of, 6
- Northcote, Sir Stafford, 36, 44; his attack on Mr. Gladstone, *Current Events*, 254
- O'CONNELL, 31, 295, 309
- O'Donoghue, The, 31
- Oleron, laws of, 339
- Olier, his relations with Charles II., 149
- Oliva, general of the Jesuits, 158–160; letter of, 167, 168
- Olmsted, Mr., quoted, 117
- Ormond, 148, 149, 170
- Orrery, Lord, 170
- Orsini, Cardinal, 151, 153
- Orsini, 303
- Osborne, Mr. Bernal, 37
- Oxenstierna, 87, 88
- PALGRAVE, the, 85
- Pallavicini, Cardinal, 151
- Palmer, *Egyptian Chronicles*, 421
- Palmerston, Lord, character of, 30
- Pappus, 88
- Paul, grand duke, afterwards emperor, 97
- Peel, Sir Robert (the late), 310
- Peel, Sir Robert, *Current Events*, 265
- Peerlkamp, his theories upon Horace (*Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina*), noticed, 238
- Perraud on Ireland, 289
- Petion, Mulatto governor of Hayti, 380; his constitution, *ib.*
- Petre, Father, 167
- Philip of Hesse, 82, 83
- Philistines, first appearance of, in Palestine, 441
- Phillips, an American writer on general average, 343, 345
- Phillips, Dr. G., 513
- Piper, Dr., on the Anglo-Saxon calendars and martyrologies, noticed, 532
- Pitt, William, 303, 305, 307
- Pius IX., allocution of, 267
- Plato, *Theætetus*, 522
- Poland, partition of, 5, 97; second ditto, 98
- Polverel, 366
- Poole, Mr., his articles in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, 421
- Poor Relief in England and France, 312, &c.
- Poor Relief in France, history of, 320–324; principles of, 314, 321
- Portland, Duke of, 305
- Prat, M., *Histoire du Père Ribadeneyra*, noticed, 242
- Primitive religion (theology), 452; cosmogony, 457; sacrifice, 462
- Prior H., *Juvenalis Satiræ XVI.*, noticed, 526
- Protestant and Catholic functionaries in Ireland, comparative numbers of 298, 299
- Protestant cause in Ireland, 296, 297
- Prussia and the Gotha party, 79
- Prussia, formation of, 93; its relations with Austria, *ib.*
- Prussia, policy of, after the death of Frederick II., 98; becomes one of the great powers, 102; its policy from 1815 to 1848, *ib.*; parliamentary system has no roots in, 105; ministerial crisis in, *Current Events*, 570
- Psalters, ancient, 496
- RAMBLER, the, 510
- Rapp, *Geschichte des Griechischen Schauspiels vom Standpunkt der dramatischen Kunst*, noticed, 528
- Ravallac, 85
- Raynal, Abbé, *History of the Antilles*, 368
- Rebellion, the Great, 2
- Recent Irish Legislation, 52
- Reformation, 2
- Retz, Cardinal de, 149, 150; quoted, 293
- Revolution, the French, 2
- Rhind, Thebes, its Tombs and their Tenants, noticed, 222
- Rhodian law, 337, 339
- Richard I., 339
- Richelieu, 85, 86
- Richmond, *Memoir of the Fifth Duke of*, noticed, 245
- Riethmüller, C. J., *Frederick Lucas, a Biography*, noticed, 552
- Rigaud, General, 370
- Rinuccini, 155
- Rock, Dr. 473
- Roebuck, Mr. 37
- Rohan, Henri de, a name assumed by James Stuart, 159



- Roman imperialism, 8  
 Romans, 8  
 Rome, 6; Rome, Current Events, 266  
 Rospigliosi, Cardinal, 172  
 Rougé, Viscount de, 421, 424, 428, 431.  
 Rousseau, quoted, 21  
 Rudolph II. (emperor), 85  
 Ruskin, Four Essays on Political Economy, noticed, 557  
 Russia, 99  
 Ryswick, treaty of, 362
- St. JOHN, Spencer, Life in the Forests of the far East, noticed, 247  
 Saint-Martin, M. Matter's Life of, noticed, 545  
 St.-Pierre, Abbé de, 92  
 Salvage, 346  
 Santana, Don Pedro, 389, 390, 391  
 Savage Life in Africa, 129  
 Schenkendorf, 102  
 Schiller, 96  
 Schlegel, Frederick, 513  
 Schools, the three, of Catholic literature during the last century, described, 513-515  
 Science of Language, the, 175  
 Scotland, system of governing, 308  
 Secours d'hospice, 332  
 Secret History of Charles II., 146  
 Servile insurrection in Hayti, 1791, 366  
 Sigismund (emperor), 91  
 Silesia, 93  
 Sisters of charity, 333  
 Slavery, abolished by the Constituent Assembly in 1791, 365  
 Slavery in North America, 116, 117; in Africa, 142-143; French and Spanish laws of, compared, 363, 364  
 Sleidanus, 84  
 Smith, Mr. Goldwin, on Ireland, 303, &c., 310  
 Smith, Sydney, 310  
 Sobieski, 168  
 Social Science Congress and general average, 357  
 Sonthonax, 366-369  
 Soulouque, emperor of Hayti, account of, 384-387  
 Spain, 5, 10  
 Spain, its relations with Hayti, 361; slave-law, 363; regains St. Domingo, 391  
 Spedding, the Letters and Life of Francis Bacon, noticed, 241  
 Stanley, Lord, 28; speech at King's Lynn, Nov. 22, 1861, 40, 310  
 Stansfeld, Mr., debate on his resolution, June 4, 1862, 46
- State-papers, quoted, 151, 163, 172  
 Statistics of French charitable foundations, 318-320; of bureaux de bienfaisance, 324, &c.; of indigents, 325; of public assistance in Paris, 331, 332; of slaves in Hayti in 1790, 365  
 Stein, the Baron, 10  
 Stolberg, 513  
 Story, Justice, 342  
 Stuart, James, Prince (see Cloche, de la), 160  
 Stuart, James, an impostor, who personated the preceding, 161-163  
 Stuart, Lady Mary (pseudo), 161  
 Surtees Society, 473, 536  
 Sybel, Professor, 106, 107, 108, 109
- TALLEMANT des RÉAUX, 165  
 Talleyrand, on the Polish question in 1815, 11; type of the diplomatic statesman, 30  
 Tapparelli, 513  
 Tchadaïeff, select works of, noticed, 551  
 Teulet, Relations politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Écosse au 16<sup>me</sup> siècle, noticed, 241  
 Tewkesbury Missal, 490  
 Theatrum Europæum, 88  
 Thirty Years' War, 85 sqq.  
 Tilly, 86  
 Toryism, character of, 48  
 Toussaint Louverture, account of, 367-374; character of, 375-378  
 Trench, Rev. F., A Few Notes from Past Life, noticed, 245  
 Trollope's North America, 111.  
 Tudor, O. D., his Leading Cases on Mercantile and Maritime law, reviewed, 335, 359  
 Turenne, 158  
 Turin, Current Events, 270  
 Turkey, the Slave provinces of, Current Events, 593
- UNDERHILL's West Indies, quoted, 139  
 Union of Ireland, why defective, 305-308  
 Universities in Germany, their politics, 103  
 Urquhart, Mr. P., 46
- VACATION TOURISTS, noticed, 248  
 Vaughan, Dr., 147  
 Victor Emmanuel, 110  
 Victor Hugo's Misérables, reviewed, 392 sqq.  
 Vienna, Congress of, its treatment of nationality, 12  
 Villeneuve-Bargemont, 327  
 Voltaire, 92

Volunteers, an element of Conservative reaction, 47

WALPOLE, Mr., 46

Walters, Lucy, 146

Watteville, M. de, 325

Weijtsen, 343

Wellington, Duke of, 310

Welwood, quoted, 149, 166

Weninger, Dr., his Protestantism and Infidelity, noticed, 560

Whalley, Mr., 31, 39

Whigs, have lost their old doctrines, 34; their alliance with the Radicals, 35

Whigs, the Holland-house, had no sympathy for the cause that triumphed at Waterloo, 11

Whiteside, Mr., 47

Wilberforce, 31; quoted, 310

Wilkes, 32

William I., 339

William III., 73

William of Nassau, 84

Wisbuy, code of, 339, 347

Wiseman, Cardinal, 501-503; his Rome and the Catholic Episcopate, reviewed, 503-510

Wydenbrugg, 106

YORCK, Marshal, 101

York, Duke of (James II.), 146, 158, 165

York Manual, 488

York Minster, Fabric Rolls of, 136

ZIMMERMANN, Dr., 103

















